

## **Transcendence of the Modern State**

**Note to reader:** We denote footnotes with numbers, like so<sup>1</sup>. They are informational and *very important to read*. We denote endnotes with capital letters. Endnotes are for citations. Sometimes a footnote will have a citation within it. In these cases, the endnote(s) with the citation(s) will appear immediately after the footnote in the main text.

We intend this essay as a thought experiment examining the problems of modern society and how people may live happier, more fulfilling lives. We have thought and researched meticulously but we can always be wrong. We are not all knowing. We don't have all the answers. Yet we hope that our ideas will be refined by wiser minds and spark new discussions on how to increase human flourishing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Example footnote.

## Prelude

We argue that modern American living offers the illusion of freedom while imposing the *opposite*. Cultural, political, and technological forces (e.g., geographic mobility, modern Leftism) compel us to live in unnatural ways, leading to loneliness, anxiety, and depression. These forces are economically selected for, and thus likely to only grow more powerful with time. But we still hold great optimism. We argue citizens should organize in small groups (referred to as communes) to form their own governments and way of life, free of the unnatural burdens of American living.

*“You can’t just form your own government. You need a violent revolution. And for that you need armies. You need capital. You need a mass following.”* This is the (reasonable) assumption many make. The word “government” conjures images of massive bureaucracies.

But in truth governments are everywhere. The Amish form their own governments and laws. Every small town elects a mayor who amends policy. Groups of home owners form housing associations to establish rules. Even small apartment complexes have boards which vote on matters. Church groups have leaders which prescribe ways of life. We shall suggest nothing outside these scopes. And absolutely nothing we suggest involves any form of violence (which we strongly detest).

As you read, you will find that our outline for an ideal commune is vague. This is intentional, as a narrow vision is not adaptive to circumstance. Much of the American Constitution was left intentionally vague (consider the “necessary and proper” clause or the lack of definition for “interstate commerce”). Even vaguer was the Declaration of Independence, which merely aired grievances and outlined a set of governing ideals. Consider this our declaration in long form.

An important clarification: the chief concern of the commune *has nothing to do with sharing or inequality*. From hierarchies flow inequality, and we view status hierarchies as (unfortunately) inevitable, an unavoidable consequence of human nature<sup>2</sup>. We thus seek not to abolish inequality – as this is impossible – though we seek to minimize the injuries inequality inflicts.

The pursuit of absolute equality is, in fact, dangerous. This pursuit by a society often justifies the imposition of draconian measures. This is because, in order to have any *chance* of achieving absolute equality, a society *must* institute extreme social controls (as some forms of inequality are inevitable). When these draconian measures inevitably fail to produce absolute equality, these failures are used as evidence for the need of *even more draconian* measures (the society functions much like a gambling addict who perpetually believes his only mistake is not playing the slot machines long enough). For this reason, societies which pursue equality as their primary goal are often co-opted by the power hungry, who leverage draconian social controls to attain more power.

Moreover, societies oriented around absolute equality remove personal responsibility from citizens. Any individual’s poor circumstance is, by definition, society’s fault for failing to sufficiently impose equality of outcome. This not only diminishes citizens’ drive to be productive, but also decreases their sense of control over their own lives (as citizens view their outcomes as

---

<sup>2</sup> One can read 12 Rules for Life, Chapter 1, to learn how hierarchy is deeply evolved in nearly all animals, not just humans.

dependent on society, rather than their own actions). This is bad because much research shows that those with a higher “locus of control” are happier<sup>A</sup>.

Instead, the chief concern of the commune is *social disconnection* derived from the unnatural state of American living. We seek to form a community in which members have deep life-long friendships. In which social trust is high and crime is low. In which families are stable and members are romantically satisfied. In which citizens have common values and a common culture. In which members derive a great sense of purpose from their role in the community. In which children (and adults) are connected with nature and viewed not as widgets to be contorted from their natural state to fit the needs of an economic system which cares not of their well-being. In which mothers are connected to their children. In which citizens are happy and healthy. In which freedom of speech and ideas abounds<sup>3</sup>. And in which reasonable differences of opinion form not barriers to relationships.

---

<sup>3</sup> Exists in abundance.

## Part 1: The Modern State

### **Part 1A: Modern Separation**

We (Americans) are lonely. We are disconnected from one another. We are socially isolated. Yet technology supplies an arsenal of entertainment which distracts from feelings of emptiness. We need not think too hard about the coldness which gnaws at us when we may drug it away through a screen.

In fact, we are largely in denial of our loneliness. We rationalize lunchroom chats with coworkers and twice weekly beers with friends as a healthy social life. We compare our social lives to the similarly dysfunctional social lives of peers and conclude we must be doing alright. We blame depression and anxiety on other circumstance or biochemistry (though these factors may certainly play a role). Ask any individual, and they are likely to deny that they are lonely and truly mean it.

Yet statistics tell us a different story. In 2021, 15% of men reported zero close friends in 2021. *None*. Just 30 years ago, this figure was 3%<sup>B</sup>. 49% of Americans today have fewer than 3 close friends (compared to 27% in 1990)<sup>C</sup>. We can see from statistics provided by the surgeon general that these trends existed long before COVID<sup>D</sup>. The American surgeon general is in fact so concerned with these trends, he has labelled “loneliness and isolation” an epidemic. Moreover, teenagers are lonelier, more depressed, and having less sex than ever before<sup>E</sup>. We see too from these statistics that things were not always this way. Isolation is not inevitable to the human experience – it is a product of modern living. So let us examine our natural state to see where we have gone astray.

For almost all of human evolution, we lived in small tribes. These tribes constituted our social circle for our entire life. We worked with tribes on common goals such as hunting or building shelter. Our time was spent almost exclusively in the company of others, rarely alone.

Loyalty to one’s tribe was vital, as a tribe requires cohesion to function. Someone unloyal to the tribe, who could freely take up with another group, was a threat to this cohesion. Thus, we evolved to form strong bonds with those we meet early in life and maintain these bonds, rather than form constant new ones.

This natural loyalty to early relationships, we believe, is especially strongly evolved in men. Observe that, as a man, you are expected to live and die by your tribe. If your tribe is conquered by another, you have no place in this new society. You are, at best, a threat to the reproductive dominance of your conquerors and killed. At worst, you are an asset for labor and enslaved.

As a woman, if you are decently attractive, you may at least stand a chance of survival by reproducing with the conquering tribe<sup>4</sup>. Thus, we believe some flexibility in loyalty is selected for in women. We observe this in practice. When women first go to college, they often find friends faster, whereas for men this process is slower and more arduous. Similarly, men appear to struggle harder with forming relationships later in life. Yet, research shows that both sexes have extreme

---

<sup>4</sup> As opposed to men, who stand *no chance* of being accepted by a conquering tribe.

difficulty forming new friendships after the age of 25<sup>F,G,H</sup>, which makes remaining connected to early-life friends important.

Yet, today, most Americans do the opposite. Many leave their home town for college. Then move after graduation to a different city in search of lucrative employment. Then move again. And again. With each move, Americans often become further removed in both geography and life experience from their earliest friends. This is not natural. Our brains are not evolved to withstand having our social environments completely upended many times.

Even more insidious is the *illusion of choice* offered by American mobility, when, in reality, choice is now removed from the individual. On the surface, the ability to move anywhere appears an amazing freedom. We may choose from a number of large cities and enjoy cars and planes which transport us. We even have phones so we can maintain contact with those we leave behind. And if we want, we may choose never to leave home.

However, in practice, Americans have no meaningful choice in the destruction of their social fabric. Consider the course of a middle to upper class American life. One attends a high school which is, in many ways, designed to be hellish, requiring one to wake unhealthily early and sit inside for most of the daylight. Furthermore, at this time, one must adjust to puberty and endure near constant sexual confusion and frustration.

Then, one goes off to college and one's life becomes, in many ways, a million times better. One has freedom of schedule and wake time. One lives among friends and has constant social opportunities with those pre-selected for on the basis of similar IQ and life goals (note that similarity is predictive of liking<sup>I,J</sup>). One also has plenty of sexual and romantic opportunities, no longer incumbered by living with parents. And one is still young enough to form deep bonds with peers in a way not possible as a full adult. In many ways, college life resembles commune living (which is why many call it the best four years of their life).

Humans are pattern recognizing machines. And the pattern drilled into American minds is that leaving home makes life way better. Moreover, many graduate with a rich social circle, making social isolation an abstract, almost inconceivable problem. So, when Americans choose where to live after graduation, they often decline to move back home, instead following high salaries, moving someplace new with few thoughts of potential loneliness. At the time, this choice seems obvious. Most want to achieve financial security, high status, and to impress others with their success. It's a big country. The chances that the optimal paying job is exactly where one grew up are miniscule.

Moreover, Americans culturally glorify leaving home. "You're gonna go far, kid" – a mantra of American potential for success – implies that in order to flourish, one must leave home and move on to bigger and better places. You must travel – "go far" – to achieve your dreams.

Yet life is not college. Making new friends is difficult as an adult. And many find over time that old relationships dwindle, while new ones become increasingly harder to form as they age, especially for men (recall that research shows people fail to make new friends after around 25

while losing old ones). And so, many find themselves lonely, having moved away from old friends without forming comparable new ones<sup>5</sup>.

This fate is inevitable even for those who do not move at all. Suppose at the age of 17, one can foresee *all of this* before applying to colleges. One could apply to a college near home to stay near to family and afterward continue to live in one's hometown. Yet one's oldest friends will still likely move away. Home will no longer have the same people. One will still find themselves in a similar predicament of separation from the natural course of relationships.

Thus, we ask: does one really *choose* this fate? Or, rather, is this fate instead chosen by the invisible hand of the market? Observe that American mobility is conducive to economic productivity. Technology companies can now assemble many of the smartest people in the country in one place. This is an amazing feat, which leads to breakthrough advances such as AI or the internet. But we pay a cost. Our culture has evolved to be less family oriented, to glorify leaving town, to separate us from one another in the pursuit of advancements in productivity<sup>6K</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> American mobility is also a massive killer of romantic relationships. A majority of readers have likely suffered a breakup due to distance. We find this fact terribly sad, and oft overlooked as just an inevitable part of life.

<sup>6</sup> This feels rather handwavy. While many accept the premise that free markets select for that which is most economically efficient, one may reasonably ask: how? How does a culture evolve? Observe that those most economically successful exert outsized influence on the culture. They write the books we read and the shows we watch. They control our media. And they disproportionately got rich *by leaving home*. By being less family oriented and more individualistic in their pursuits.

Most everyone believes their life choices are the right ones (observe the famous psychology finding that gamblers are much more confident in their bets directly *after* placing them). Once we commit to a decision, we rationalize it as correct. Our brains cannot handle thinking we may have screwed up (I, myself, am a rare exception as I fear I have screwed up decisions right after making them *all the time*).

Thus, those who write our movie scripts and digital newspapers glorify the life paths they took. Film plots often revolve around a character *escaping* their home town (think *Good Will Hunting*, the *Truman Show*, *Star Wars* (Luke escapes his home planet)). Much of the mainstream media derides small towns. Journals like NYT are littered with pieces on how small towns are oppressive – even when much research shows people in small towns are actually happier (though the politics of small towns is certainly a contributing factor in this slander).

We do *not* allege some elaborate plot to influence American culture to maximize economic efficiency. Instead, culture evolves through a collection of many people, all individually saying and acting upon what they believe is right. This is how free markets work. Nobody conspires to organize society around that which is most economically efficient. Society is pushed that way through the individual actions of millions.

In the most simplistic terms, we can think of American culture like a high school. Everyone wants to be like the cool and popular kids. If all the cool and popular kids wear Levi's jeans, everyone thinks Levi's jeans are cool. Many don't have the conscious thought: "Levi's jeans are cool *because* the cool and popular kids wear them." They just think these jeans are cool. The influence of the cool and popular is subconscious. This is why Sprite pays LeBron tens of millions to endorse their product. Few think: "Sprite must taste good because LeBron is in the commercial." Most just think Sprite is cool (or at least cooler than if LeBron didn't endorse them). LeBron's coolness and popularity influences them subconsciously.

Observe that money, the main measure of American status, makes one cool and popular. So, if all the cool and popular people (that is, the rich people) leave their hometown and tell everyone to do so through movies, magazines, etc., leaving one's hometown becomes cool and popular. If you don't do it, you're *uncool*.

We do not wish to diminish the benefits of technological advancements, which have cured disease, reduced hunger, and allowed for population growth; yet, in many ways, modern technology serves to isolate us *further*. Struggling toward a common goal – suffering alongside others – brings people together. Observe that soldiers in war are often bonded for life by their experiences<sup>7</sup>. Yet today, technology now allows us to live in extreme comfort. We need not work together to hunt for food or endure together in times of cold. When we do endure physical discomforts, it is often individually, not as a group.

This condition is so unnatural we often artificially impose group suffering. For example, fraternities haze new recruits. Enduring this hazing *together* bonds members for life. Our culture now increasingly decries hazing as barbaric, which it is. Frat recruits have been forced to strip naked while being made to hold another man's penis, forced to drink their own urine, and forced to take LSD then lie underneath floorboards while the fraternity throws a party above them. If you wonder why anyone would allow themselves to be subjected to such horrific treatment, consider the state of modern isolation. Many are so desperate for connection they will go to these extreme lengths just to feel like part of a close-knit group. To feel like part of a tribe.

Our limitless entertainment options have also supplemented the need or want to interact with others. We would rather sit at home, watching our favorite show, than endure the inconvenience of traveling to see friends. We would rather watch pornography than endure the discomfort of approaching a member of the opposite sex. Yet, these preferences do not represent rational value judgements – almost any pornography user would confess that a *real* relationship is more fulfilling. But we humans are hardwired to pursue expedient pleasure. And so, we allow technology to isolate us, all while having some conscious awareness that this is not good – that we are cyborg phone addicts in a closed-off world of endless entertainment<sup>8</sup>.

Moreover, our tremendous *choice* in entertainment decreases common ground. In the 1980's there were three networks. Everyone watched the same few shows. Because that was all there was. Now, there are thousands of channels, and this is still not enough choice! We hardly watch network TV (save, for sports and the news) because it does not offer enough choice. We opt for services like Netflix or Hulu which allow us to watch our exact show of choice at the exact moment we wish – choosing from tens of thousands of options. Our culture is thus fractured. We are all in a unique entertainment bubble. The odds that any two people are watching the same show at the same time are slim – giving them less shared experience (recall that similarity predicts liking).

This is, perhaps, one reason many are more invested in politics today. While there are endless different shows, there is only *one* presidential election. We are all watching the *same* one.

Politics obsession also offers a poor substitute for feeling like part of a tribe. There is a catharsis in feeling angry about the same things others are angry about. This anger temporarily fills the void of real social connection. Ever notice how those obsessed with politics tend not to be socially satisfied types (as one does not need to obsess over LGBTQ bathroom debates when one has a rich

---

<sup>7</sup> This is merely an example to illustrate a point. We are *not* advocating for war in any way. We oppose war.

<sup>8</sup> Moreover, the ability to attain instant technological pleasure conditions us to be increasingly inflexible. We are accustomed to having exactly what we want – having exact control over which meme we view or which game we play. This is bad because relationships require flexibility and compromise.

social life)? These people tend to be more like yours truly: relatively isolated from others<sup>9</sup>. For further evidence that loneliness increases political obsession, observe that BLM riots surged during COVID, the time when people felt most isolated.

Our media and social media corporations are large contributors to polarization. As they've improved their understanding that maximizing clicks has nothing to do with telling the truth, they increasingly feed users endless lies, algorithmically designed to make them angry at those on the other end of the political aisle. For example, many Democrats truly believe Donald Trump called Neo-Nazis fine people after the Charlottesville riots (when, in reality, he said "I'm not talking about the Neo-Nazis, they should be condemned totally."). Similarly, many Republicans truly believe that Hillary Clinton was part of a pedophile ring operating within a Pizza parlor. Polarization is exacerbated by social media, as posts which spark hatred for those with different beliefs tend to draw more engagement and go viral<sup>L</sup>.

Political polarization has torn apart American friendships. It has even torn apart families, as people have become increasingly intolerant of those with differing views, brainwashed to believe them akin to Nazis or Communists.

This destruction of relationships is aided by immense choice in who we interact with. Today, as nearly all our interactions are digitally facilitated (even if we hang out in-person, we text to set it up), we may cut nearly anyone out of our lives with ease – we may craft our social circle to consist of only those who agree with us on everything and rarely irritate us (for many, this turns out to be very few people).

Previously, if someone disagreed with you politically, you *had* to interact with them. You didn't have a choice. And, you would likely find out that they were a decent person with whom you could get along just fine.

Polarization and choice in interaction create a self-reinforcing feedback loop which makes us more alone. The more one cuts social ties with opposite political party members, the more one's impression of the opposite party is reliant on the news and social media (which tend to display this party in the worst possible light). Thus, the more one demonizes opposite party members in their mind (note that increased contact with out-groups moderates opinions about them<sup>M</sup>). And thus, the more one decides to confine one's interactions to those of similar political ideology, which leads to even *more* hatred of those whose ideologies differ.

We see again how the vice of choice subtly inflicts harm. For those radicalized by polarization, choice in interaction does not expand one's social circle. It confines it. Even if one does not discriminate *at all* on the basis of political ideology, one must likely endure the discrimination of others, regardless of one's political affiliation.

Furthermore, lack of choice in interaction – being *forced* to be around others – often brings people together. I recall sleepaway camp as a kid (another form of living which approximates a commune in many ways). I went several summers, each summer for four weeks. During this time, I shared a

---

<sup>9</sup> I confess I have fallen victim at points in my life to spending long hours on the internet in outrage. And I can say with confidence this did nothing to improve my happiness.

bunk with around twelve other boys my age. If given the choice, I would almost certainly have chosen to have my own room where I could have privacy and relief from constant contact with bunkmates, some of whom annoyed me. Yet, I found in just four weeks I grew incredibly close with nearly everyone. By the end, I even considered some of those I initially detested to be my brothers. I would have never chosen to interact with some of these people if not forced to. Yet I'm glad I was forced to. I say this having been bullied at camp. Having, at times, hated it<sup>10</sup>.

Of course, some kids at the camp I never grew to like. Some appeared to have serious mental problems. Yet even these campers served a positive function: I bonded with others over our mutual dislike for them. The experience of needing to endure, alongside peers, the outbursts of a camper with extreme anger issues, for example, brought me closer to others.

I also recall being excited for high school to end. Once I graduate, I thought, I would never need to see some of my classmates again – some of whom were real jerks. Yet, as I look back, these people were positive contributions to my high school experience. I bonded with friends over our mutual inability to *stand* some of our classmates.

People like to talk about other people they both know. We like to gossip. This desire is hardwired in nearly everyone's brain. Yet as we constantly move and change social circles and our friends become increasingly long distance, our mutual acquaintances decrease. There becomes less to talk about. We believe this is one reason many are obsessed with celebrity gossip: celebrities are people nearly everyone knows. Thus, they are substitutes for the conversations that flow naturally in small communities, in which people have a plethora of shared acquaintances.

Yet as we all sink deeper into our specific entertainment microcosms – watching a small subset of tens of thousands of shows, listening to a small subset of tens of thousands of musical artists – we obsess over only a small subset of celebrity gossip related to our specific interests, distinct from almost everyone else's<sup>11</sup>. Thus, there becomes a growing feeling that *there is nothing to talk about*. And so, most human interaction becomes increasingly boring. We thus retreat further into ourselves, valuing television and videogames over social connection.

Cities also condition us to be anti-social. Kids raised in cities are taught to be distrustful. Crime is a constant threat. Strangers are dangerous. *Don't talk to them!* Moreover, in city life, one finds oneself constantly annoyed by the presence of others. In traffic, one resents other drivers. In crowds, one resents the anxiety others impose upon them<sup>12</sup>. In a city, one is often busy. Other people are constantly *in the way*. We see that city life conditions us to view strangers as obstacles and threats. And when strangers constitute the majority of interactions, this conditions us to view *people* this way. Thus, human interactions are devalued on a subconscious level.

---

<sup>10</sup> Regrettably, the barrier of distance has now separated me from all I once knew at camp. We now all live separate lives in separate places and maintain only extremely occasional conversation.

<sup>11</sup> For example, fans of QCX's latest hyper-trap album obsess over recent photos which suggest he is cheating on longtime girlfriend, Latisha Storm. Actually, we just made up all of that. But you wouldn't know, considering how many *different* celebrity microcosms there are these days.

<sup>12</sup> Many find being in crowds stressful. Perhaps this is evolved due to crowds' tendency to spread disease.

In summary, we see that our modern way of living and technology has isolated us. Separated from cohesive, lifelong social groups, we cling to unnatural substitutes for genuine connection: celebrity gossip, pornography, fraternity hazing, political anger.

## **Part 1B: Modern Leftism**

Any discussion of American isolation is incomplete without addressing modern Leftism. We believe the rise of far-Leftist ideology has made Americans more depressed and further isolated from one another.

We attribute this rise of Leftism mainly to technology. We argue that with the rise of automation, the value of physical labor has decreased; and so too has the value of men in a capitalist market (as they are the physically stronger sex). This has led to the abolition of gender roles and a female dominated culture, which fosters modern Leftism – an ideology which has been co-opted by the powerful with perverse incentives. As neither technology nor capitalist incentives shall vanish anytime soon, we believe the grip of modern Leftism will only strengthen in the future, leaving Americans more disconnected from one another.

But in order to fully understand all of this, we first have some political philosophizing to do.

“Right” and “Left” are used often to describe political ideology, yet many disagree on exactly what these words mean. Curtis Yarvin describes the Right-Left political divide as a battle between those who favor order (the Right) and those who favor chaos (the Left)<sup>N</sup>. Jonathan Haidt frames the Right-Left divide upon conceptions of morality: those on the Right view morality along many similarly-weighted dimensions (“in-group loyalty,” “purity,” “respect for authority,” “fairness,” “harm”) whereas Leftists heavily prioritize “fairness” and “harm” in their conceptions of morality<sup>O</sup>. Scientists have theorized the Right-Left divide to have biological roots, with those on the Right more biologically predisposed to be disgusted by things<sup>P</sup>.

All of the above are defensible descriptions of the Right/Left divide. Which illustrates why no framing of the Right/Left divide will be perfect (after all, if many different framings are defensible, it’s hard to argue that one is absolutely correct). Yet we believe the primary divide between Right and Left is best characterized as a divide between “nature” and “nurture<sup>13</sup>.”

We shall exaggerate below to illustrate the point.

Leftists are on the side of nurture. They believe human nature is malleable, a result of one’s environment. Any differences between group outcomes result from socialization or discrimination rather than inherent group differences. For example, if women are underrepresented in STEM careers, this is due to the societal imposition of gender norms and/or hiring discrimination, *not* due to any inherent biological differences between men and women. Because all humans are mere products of their environment, all humans are born *equal*: identical blank slates which society then shapes. Thus, human outcomes should all be equal. This is the natural order of things. Inequality represents a moral failing on the part of society, disrupting this natural order.

---

<sup>13</sup> What follows may seem tedious. But we promise, it will be very important later.

Because human nature is flexible – a product of environment – there is no right or wrong way of being. One should pursue the way of being which brings one the most happiness and fulfillment. For example, if someone is born a man and wishes to be a woman, he should reassign his sex. If there is inequality, human nature should be changed to rectify it. For example, if there are fewer women in STEM, male and female nature should be *changed* through adjustments to cultural messaging, socialization, etc. to achieve equality. Girls should be *nurtured* to be more math focused.

Leftists, as natural nurturers, have an inherent affinity towards those in need of nurturing. Thus, they love the weak. They seek to protect the unfortunate, to nurture them to prosperity. The strong and powerful represent products of unfair societal advantages, which Leftists detest. The strong and successful thus repulse many on the left.

The Right, on the other hand, is the philosophy of nature. Right-wingers believe human nature is fixed, unalterable by environment. Humans are mostly selfish. This is inevitable. They must thus be motivated by incentive structures which channel their selfishness for public good. Hence, the Right adores free markets and punishment for crime.

As human nature is fixed, the Right believes group differences in outcome are often the result of inherent differences. For example, if women are underrepresented in STEM careers, this is likely because male DNA codes for traits which lead to STEM success (for example, assertiveness, interest in things rather than people, etc.). Any attempt to bridge this gap by socializing men and women to be more alike is a grotesque distortion of the natural order.

Herein lies a paradox of Rightism. The Right believes human nature is unavoidably flawed. Yet the Right believes the “virtues” of human nature must be preserved, that human nature is a fixed and sacred thing not to be altered. In justifying this view, conservatives often look to religion: God made people a certain way for a reason. We are not to tamper with God’s work. Thus, if someone born a man wishes to undergo a sex change, conservatives may view this as an unnatural distortion of the natural human condition (to liberals, this is absurd: there’s no such thing as the natural human condition. The human condition is already entirely sculpted by society. Changing it to that which improves happiness is *good*).

A natural pitfall of right-wing ideology is rejection of the marginalized. Human nature is immensely complex. And our brains are bad with complexity. And so, conservatives inevitably simplify human nature, leaving those on the margins excluded from their worldview. For example, most people are not gay. Thus, conservatives fashion an ideology around human nature as being straight. Those that are gay are thus unnatural<sup>14,Q,R</sup>(of course, many conservatives have no prejudice against gays).

---

<sup>14</sup> We disagree. Observe the “good uncle hypothesis,” the continued prevalence of homosexuality throughout history (for example, Ancient Greece), and homosexuality in animals.

Observe that almost(!) any Right/Left political disagreement can be traced to a fundamental disagreement about human nature<sup>15</sup>.

For example, those on the far Left want to abolish the police. Those on the Right want increased law and order. Leftists believe humans, with the right system, can be good. Thus, police aren't necessary to maintain peace (but abolishing a white supremacist system is, since people are products of their environment). Right-wingers believe humans are inherently selfish and violent. If police are removed and there are no consequences for crime, people will commit more crime. (We see from Haidt that conservatives rank "authority" much higher in their conceptions of morality).

Similarly, the Left has more compassion for criminals. To liberals, criminals are a product of their environment, in need of reform. We need not penalize violence harshly. We must *nurture* them to be non-violent. To conservatives, criminals are bad people (as human nature is fixed and not a product of environment). They thus deserve no compassion. And we should make a harsh example of them to deter other bad people from doing bad things.

Consider also the issue of pre-marital sex (and, relatedly, abortion, contraception, etc.). To the Right, human's ability to civilize themselves – to control sexual impulse and tame the depraved urge toward sexual indulgence – is part of what separates us from animals: part of what makes humanity great<sup>16</sup>. And the Right believes the great virtues of human nature must be preserved. To the Left, this is absurd. How does someone else's bedroom activities have anything to do with you? The notion that premarital sex would degrade the greatness of human nature does not even occur to a liberal (thus, we see liberals rank "purity" far lower in moral conceptions).

Uncoincidentally, we also see liberals have more compassion for animals. Whereas conservatives – who believe in the greatness of human nature as the highest form of being – put the well-being of animals further beneath the well-being of people.

Note as well that the Right tends to see greater value in family. Humans are evolved to prioritize family members (as this is conducive to their DNA reproducing in future generations). The Right views the prioritization of family as central to what it means to be human. They thus seek to protect this "virtue" of human nature, even at the expense of fairness or equality. To the Left, "family" is merely a societal construction (as human nature can take infinitely many forms). Thus, we see far-Left regimes – such as Stalinism – seek to *change* this social structure and abolish the family altogether. The nuclear family is oft derided in modern liberal culture. (And thus, we see liberals rank "in-group" loyalty lower in conceptions of morality)<sup>S</sup>.

The Right/Left divide on human nature even motivates disagreements on climate change. To liberals, trusting the scientists is an obvious choice. They know more than us. They are telling us climate change is a problem. Conservatives, however, are wary of the vices of human nature. Believing people are selfish and motivated by incentives, they are distrustful of scientists whose

---

<sup>15</sup> Recall, we are exaggerating to illustrate a point. Only an imbecile believes human nature is *entirely* fixed or *entirely* a result of one's environment. In reality, most everyone recognizes this. But conservatives are further to the nature end of the spectrum and liberals are further to the nurture end on the matter of human nature.

<sup>16</sup> We see there is a level of arbitrariness here with what the Right believes to be the virtues of human nature.

income and prestige is directly tied to how important they can make their field appear (which, for climate scientists, means convincing the world that climate change is a big problem).

Consider also the Right/Left divide on masks and COVID. Why is it that right-wing countries imposed fewer COVID interventions than left-wing countries (with the possible exception of Scandinavian nations)? To the Right, masks and social distancing are an unnatural distortion of the natural way of being. Much as conservatives often look lowly on tattoos, died hair, and piercings as a distortion of one's natural form, conservatives decry masks as an unnatural distortion of the human appearance. To the Left, this is silly. Focused instead on nurturing and protecting the weak, the Left looked fondly on masks and COVID restriction.

Observe that the nature vs nurture frame also well explains the Right/Left gender gap, with women more liberal than men<sup>T,U</sup>.

For the vast majority of history, women raised children; “nurture” was their primary job. They thus have a strongly evolved impulse to nurture and protect the weak. Thus, women are more equality-oriented, desiring a society which protects the weak (as this is their evolved desire, selected for on the basis of protecting children).

Moreover, women are the weaker sex physically; and for the vast majority of history, physical threats were plentiful. Women themselves were more vulnerable than men. It thus follows that woman evolved to be more equality-oriented in their conception of an ideal society for their own protection. They naturally desire a society which protects the weak (for this was their predicament for the vast majority of evolution's history).

Due to their role as nurturers, women are likely evolved with a natural belief in the malleability of human nature. Women's role was to shape their children's' character through nurturing. To fulfill this role, one must have inherent faith in the ability of environment to alter one's nature. It thus seems evolutionarily advantageous for women to have even irrational faith in nurture's ability to shape human nature (as a mother who puts excess effort into raising her child right is certainly preferable to one who undervalues nurture and puts in too little effort nurturing her child). And women see the molding human nature as a virtuous task (as this was their role throughout history).

Observe too that malleability of character is a feminine virtue. Most men desire agreeableness in a partner. On the contrary, most women desire a man who is confident in himself and his beliefs. A man without his own convictions and interests, to most women, is pathetic. Thus, it is in a woman's self-interest to be more influenceable, while it is a man's interest to be more impervious to the influences of others. Research in fact shows that women *are* more agreeable and more conformist<sup>V,17</sup>. A woman's nature is quite literally more influenced by her environment. It thus

---

<sup>17</sup> Observe the following evolutionary explanation for female conformity: for a man, with no biological limit on reproductive abilities, it made evolutionary sense to take risk and go against the grain. To revolt against the king makes logical sense when one can become the new king and impregnate thousands. For a woman, whose reproductive ceiling is limited – and who needs the constant protection of the tribe to stay alive as the weaker sex – the risk of defying social convention lacks suitable upside. Defying the king isn't all that smart when you can only have a maximum of ten babies regardless. It thus follows that women evolved to be more conformist. In essence, men evolved to pursue more high risk, high reward strategies in life, and nonconformity is one of them.

follows that women believe more in the malleability of human nature and are more drawn to an ideology centered around this belief (as people tend to believe others are similar to themselves<sup>W</sup>).

Furthermore, female sexual selection instincts motivate Leftist traits in women. In selecting a mate, women desire power and status. Detecting these traits was (and is) essential. Reproduction for women is biologically expensive. They are limited in child-bearing capacity. Thus, they need to ensure they reproduce with the best possible mate. Furthermore, children and women (especially in pregnancy) are vulnerable. Women need a strong partner who will provide and protect. One of high status who can compel the rest of the tribe to protect as well.

But status and power can easily be faked. A gold chain may be plated. Confidence may be a charade. Thus, women often probe potential partners for weakness to gauge if they are truly confident and strong and not desperate and weak in disguise. Women may denigrate a potential partner or put him in an uncomfortable position to see how he reacts. Does he panic and scramble to win back her praise? If so, he may be weak and low-status in disguise. However, if he is cool, confident, and composed, this signals that many other women are likely interested in him (as he is not anxious about winning this particular woman's praise).

This is commonly known as a "shit test." For example, a woman may say "you're only attracted to me for my body." A weak partner may plead, "no, I really love your personality, I admire you so much." This indicates he is desperate, panicked about the possibility of losing her affection. Yet a confident man may reply sarcastically, "no way, your brain is so hot!" He is comfortable making light of her criticism. He is confident in himself. He does not need her praise. This indicates he is likely high-status and has other options.

In essence, women are hard-wired to try to weaken the strong to see who the strong truly are. Women are thus more naturally inclined toward Leftism, which strives to nurture the weak and weaken the strong.

The notion of a fundamental, evolved difference in male-female political ideology is consistent with data, as women vote for more Leftist parties in nearly every single western country today, which can hardly be shrugged off as coincidence<sup>X,Y,Z</sup>. We observe also in everyday life that women appear more liberal and more passionate about liberal politics.

Thus, in figurative terms, we can think of the Right as a stern father and the Left as a nurturing mother. One needs both a loving mother and father to be optimally raised. And there must be a balance of power between the two.

We see that both the Left and Right have faults in their views. People are not entirely shaped by environment (the exaggerated Left) nor entirely shaped by genetics (the exaggerated Right). Thus, the Left and Right need one another to tame the ills of each ideology. A severe imbalance in the forces of Right and Left leads to catastrophe. Consider Nazism (an ideology based around absolute biological destiny derived from one's race) or Stalinism (an ideology based around the pursuit of absolute economic parity). The forces of Right and Left must hold each other in check for a society to flourish.

Yet today, the forces of Right and Left have fallen greatly out of balance<sup>18</sup>.

Far Leftism has corrupted much of American culture – especially elite institutions such as academia, media, and corporations – without a cohesive counter force. We see a complete denial of human nature: gender is purely a social construct; race is purely a social construct. All inequalities are attributed to oppression. Society is divided into “victims” and “oppressors” based on race, gender, sexuality, etc. And those who oppose these doctrines face heavy penalties: social ostracization, loss of employment, “cancellation.” Free speech has been decimated.

This phenomenon is often referred to as wokeness. We use this term because nearly all readers will have heard it before and understand what it means<sup>19, AA</sup>. Yet, we regret that many associate complaints about “wokeness” with rants of disgruntled Twitter users. It is cliché. And thus, it fails to capture the gravity of what is happening in America. The best we can describe it is this:

It is as though a great darkness has swallowed American society. This darkness has captured the minds of millions of people. Millions of good, empathetic people, who – on the remotest mention of certain issues – flip like a switch. Thirsty for blood. The darkness speaks through them much like the Ring speaks through Gollum. They speak with an anger and hatred bigger than an individual can even possess. For they are no longer an individual. They are part of a larger dark force which has stolen from them their humanity. A dark bigger than anything we can even comprehend. Slowly the darkness eats at them until the rage and sadness become them. But, of course, there is still a human being behind their eyes. Often, a human being in quite terrible psychic pain.

It may seem obvious that an ideology which encourages one to victimize themselves and catastrophize has made people more depressed. Yet we encourage all readers to read Matthew Yglesias’ piece here<sup>BB</sup> on how wokeness has contributed to a massive rise in depression (especially among liberal girls, over 30% of whom have seriously thought about suicide in the last year!)<sup>CC</sup>.

I myself recall a recent conversation with a very liberal college girl. She was pretty and blonde and from a rich family – everything, on the surface, about her life was great. And yet, she was deeply depressed. She explained that her life felt like one disaster after another. Trump being elected. Then George Floyd. Then Israel-Palestine. She was angry all the time. She was exhausted.

And yet, she was totally blind to the fact that life did not have to be this way. Totally blind to the fact that her ideology was the root of her depression (rather than injustices in the world). Reduced to constant anger and sadness, she truly could not imagine any other way of being.

Such is terribly sad. We are heart-broken to see young, healthy girls and boys wearing KN-95 masks outside, having been conditioned by extreme Leftism to live a life of constant fear. Always with shoulders hunched and solemn eyes which never seem to smile. Which glare and glance

---

<sup>18</sup> To be clear, we speak *not* of a power imbalance on issues of the economy, but rather on issues of culture, as we shall see.

<sup>19</sup> if you are unfamiliar, Andrew Sullivan has a great piece you can read in the subsequent endnote (that is, endnote “AA”) outlining woke ideology.

coldly, scanning the world for constant threat. Anxious. Afraid. Behind these eyes, there is a human being in serious need of help. This is not an existence we want for our children.

Yet we seek primarily to discuss how the rise of wokeness has further isolated Americans from one another.

One way in which wokeness separates people from one another is through social conditioning against loyalty. Observe that one way in which wokeness reproduces itself is by denying freedom of association: if you *associate* with someone who has said or done something in violation of woke norms, you are “cancelled” by association. This allows radical views to conquer mainstream discourse.

Consider the following thought experiment: suppose 20% of people in a society love the color purple. They believe it the best color in existence and anyone who disagrees is immoral. These people are called the pro-purples. 60% of people have no strong opinion on the color purple. Let’s call these people the moderates. Some moderates think purple is a nice color, though many moderates might think the pro-purples take things a bit far. But they fundamentally don’t care. They are far more concerned with paying their bills and supporting their families. The color purple has little influence over their life. Finally, 20% of people strongly oppose the color purple. Let’s call these people the anti-purples.

One would imagine an anti-purple would have no problem speaking in public. They may burn bridges with the 20% of pro-purples. But 80% of society will still be totally fine being their friend. They should have no problem getting a job through 80% of employers. And most of their existing friends are probably moderates or anti-purples anyway.

But now, let’s say the pro-purples have effectively coordinated to craft a culture whereby anyone who *associates* with an anti-purple is similarly immoral (perhaps pro-purples are disproportionately “cool and popular,” or maybe they control vectors of information such as the media and academia, which allows them to effectively coordinate). Now, any moderate businessowner will be strongly hesitant to hire a public anti-purple (and thus associate with them) as they will lose 20% of their business<sup>20</sup>. Anti-purples may also lose friends by speaking on their beliefs. Perhaps some of their close friends are dating pro-purples and would no longer associate with them. Perhaps others will simply be skittish about facing the wrath of the pro-purple minority and distance themselves.

Thus, the public discourse becomes dominated by pro-purple speech, as anti-purples speak up less and less. This give the illusion that pro-purples are in the strong majority, which further deters anti-purple speech. Over time, the pro-purples may suggest increasingly radical ideas: Let’s paint all bridges purple! Let’s paint all our churches purple! Few want to be the ones to ask: “how much is all of this going to cost.” And so, society largely steps to the side and allows the pro-purples to enact ideas the majority disagree with. Pro-purples will suggest painting all car windshields purple. The 80% is aware this is ridiculous. But no one wants to be the one to say it. Fearing for their jobs and relationships, many decide it is no big deal, they will just no longer drive.

---

<sup>20</sup> Or worse. If they hire an anti-purple, many moderates may avoid their business for fear of being perceived as associating with a business that associates with anti-purples.

What goes unsaid eventually goes unthought. Over time, the pro-purple agenda appears normal. Children don't question why cars are undrivable. They've never known anything else. And they've been so conditioned to believe it a terribly evil thought to even wonder if windshields might be better left unpainted so that people can see where they're driving.

We see a similar thing happen with wokeness in America. For example, in 2020 when BLM demanded cities defund the police, most reasonable people were aware this was a terrible idea. But nobody wanted to be the one to say it and risk being called a racist (akin to an anti-purple in our example). And so, people went along with it. Over time, many fled cities which had become too violent. This was easier than speaking out and risking one's job (and what can one person's voice really do anyway, right?).

For specific examples of freedom of association destroyed, we can look to liberal college campuses. When a student is accused of sexual assault in liberal colleges his friends are expected to drop him (regardless of credibility). Those that stick by his side or defend him often face harsh social repercussions. They are guilty by association. Perhaps this seems reasonable: only a bad person would remain friends with an assaulter. And sexual assault is an absolutely heinous crime worthy of social ostracization. Yet many modern accusations in college result from genuine misunderstands. Some accusations are even born from jealousy or a desire for attention (as the freedom to accuse someone and ruin their reputation with impunity is sometimes abused, as any absolute power inevitably is). But the expectation is still that one drops their friend unless their innocence is absolutely proven (and even then, an accusation carries incredible weight).

We can similarly observe that Chris Cuomo was fired from CNN for giving PR advice to his brother Andrew when Andrew was in the midst of a sexual misconduct scandal. Most liberals I spoke to found this firing reasonable. Yet yours truly was revolted. Loyalty to one's family is sacred. Regardless of what his brother did or did not do, Chris should remain loyal to his family and support his family. Even if my brother were on death row I would stand by and support him because that is what family does.

We may also view Dave Chapelle's latest comedy standup. In it, he describes how his friend Daphne (who is transgender) came to his defense when he was accused of writing transphobic jokes. For one tweet, defending her friend, Daphne was "cancelled" and dragged over twitter and a week later killed herself.

It is clear that the way to succeed (both socially and professionally) in modern American culture is to have no loyalty. If your friends or family is accused of violating PC norms, you should drop them, or else risk damaging your own reputation. This is cast as moral, while loyalty is culturally villainized (consider Chris Cuomo). People respond to incentives and messaging. Americans are thus conditioned to be less loyal. This inevitably transcends politics, as one cannot easily cut others off for un-PC views without reconstructing in their mind the meaning of loyalty and friendships.

This destruction of loyalty of course makes friendships more fragile and prone to ending. But on a deeper level, our cultural disdain for loyalty degrades the meaning of human connection.

Loyalty is key component of a meaningful relationship. With my closest friends, I value the fact that I can say anything to them and we will still remain friends. There is a comfort and security in this – the feeling that you can truly be yourself around another human being.

There is an intrinsic beauty in loyalty. Consider, for example, the deepest love: a parent’s love of their child. A parent’s loyalty is absolute. No matter what the child says or does, the parent will love their child. This love is beautiful. We spoke in our first section about how humans are evolved to have loyalty to their tribe. Loyalty is baked into our DNA. It is central to what it means to be a human being. And we believe there is great beauty in humanity.

And so, when every relationship is conditional on cultural approval, we lose something as a society. Friendships closer approximate contracts of mutual benefits rather than the beauty of a mother’s love for her child. With this, we denature ourselves. We lose that which is central to the meaning of the human experience: unconditional connection with other human beings.

It is perhaps no coincidence that this destruction of loyalty is a feature of the far-Left, which believes that human nature holds no fixed form and thus can be altered without consequence. Thus loyalty, if a threat to the Leftist system, should be abolished<sup>21</sup>.

Of course, it must be noted that wokeness is not the original “cancel culture.” The Salem Witch trials illustrate how mob mentality can turn hordes of people against accused individuals. I have few doubts that publicly supporting an accused witch damaged one’s reputation (much as supporting a cancelled friend does today). Religions have, throughout history, burned heretics at the stake (and, in many ways, wokeness functions as a religion, as we will later see). The mob instinct is deeply engrained within us. Modern Leftism merely capitalizes upon it.

This, however, is not a vindication of wokeness. A good society is one which tempers the most destructive human instincts while allowing the good in people to flourish – which inspires people to be less cruel and more compassionate (something wokeness certainly does *not* do).

We live in a very unforgiving culture today. It feels as though one’s worth is determined almost entirely by one’s mistakes. If you make one mistake – say one wrong thing – you’re done. Cancelled. Irredeemable. People are not allowed the leeway to make mistakes which conflict with the rules of Leftist culture and learn from them – to voice unpopular beliefs; to (unintentionally or intentionally) be offensive. This is a tremendous departure from the more traditional, Christian view that man is unavoidably flawed and thus forgiveness is a *virtue*.

Our cultural lack of forgiveness inevitably seeps into people’s psyches, destroying relationships with unrealistic expectations of perfection. I have watched reasonable people around me cut others off over minor conflicts, unwilling to forgive the slightest of transgressions. I have watched them do so with pride, believing that they were doing good. That they were being virtuous by holding others to a high standard. That they were even practicing self-respect. Yet we believe the unwillingness to forgive minor slights is not an exorcism of any sort of virtue. It is narcissism. And it drives people apart from one another.

---

<sup>21</sup> “Loyalty is sacred to what it means to be human,” some say. “Who cares?,” replies the far-Left (if these words ever reached them), “there is no such thing as human nature anyway.”

Furthermore, the unforgiving nature of woke culture also forces people to constantly self-censor, making social interactions more tense and unpleasant. This too has led to greater isolation.

Corporations, with bloated HR departments, increasingly censor speech in the office. Mundane jokes or political comments may be construed as creating a “hostile work environment.” This is bad because the workplace is the primary place many adults meet and interact with people. And humor is one of the main ways that people connect with one another. Furthermore, healthy relationships are characterized by an ability to be relaxed and be yourself around another person, uninhibited. But when conversations are dictated according to the PC rules of corporate HR departments, for many, this is not possible. Thus, workplace friendships are less close, less meaningful, contrived in an unnatural setting of censorship.

Of course, in no society can you say *anything* you want. Any society will force people to self-censor somewhat. Yet what characterizes the oppressiveness of woke censorship is the lack of charity with which words are interpreted.

Modern Leftism conditions a lack of charity in interpretation (in part) by glorifying the act of being offended. For example, consider that Anita Hill was made college professor and hero of the Left simply for accusing Clarence Thomas of making sexually inappropriate comments. Her very act of being offended and accusing makes her a hero to be admired.

And so, a whole generation of liberals grow up idolizing Anita Hill and similars, taught that reporting others for un-PC behavior makes one heroic. And everyone wants to be a hero. This behavior is reinforced everywhere, as those who victimize themselves as offended are showered with attention and lauded with praise. Thus, many jump at the chance to report an off-color joke in the workplace to HR and really believe they are doing the right thing<sup>22</sup>.

For example, a friend works at a graphic design company. This company was designing a TV commercial. The branch manager chatted with one of her friends at the company, a Black woman, about ideas for the commercial. She played the woman a number of song ideas for the commercial. One of the songs was a rap song by Cardi B, which, like most rap, had the n-word in it. The Black woman reported her boss to HR for creating a racist, hostile work environment by making her listen to a song with the n-word and the manager was put on administrative leave (I don’t know if she was then fired or not).

This illustrates how everyday people have been so conditioned to interpret things uncharitably, how interactions in the modern workplace require such a high degree of self-censorship. It also illustrates how wokeness has divided people by race.

In liberal spaces, interracial interactions are marred by tension. Many white people are literally *terrified* of saying the wrong thing to a Black person – of inadvertently committing “microaggressions,” which they have been so conditioned to view as the pinnacle of all evils. In

---

<sup>22</sup> One is reminded of 1984, in which a son turns his own father into the thought police for comments his father made in his sleep, and his father – tortured by the government – remains proud of his son’s fulfillment of civil duties in turning him in.

such an unforgiving culture, accidentally committing a microaggression can have life-altering consequences. For example, being socially ostracized, being put on leave from work (like the woman who played a famous rap song for a coworker), or even being fired.

The logical course of action for white people seeking to avoid threats to their reputation is to interact with Black people *as little as possible*. And, sadly, people respond to selfish incentives. Thus, we see college campuses and workplaces segregated by race – often with lunch tables of only Black, only Hispanic, or only white people.

Many Black people (and other minorities) feel excluded at work<sup>DD</sup>. They, quite accurately, perceive that coworkers want to limit interactions with them to polite greetings. They report trouble making friends.

Yet, when such complaints are brought up in offices, the response is always to double down on the very thing leading to workplace segregation: draconian policing of speech. More DEI training sessions are instituted to teach about the harms of microaggressions<sup>23</sup>. More HR policies encouraging the reporting of subtle racism are enacted. Of course, this leads to *even more* tension in interracial interactions, which leads to *even more* intense policing of workplace speech. Recall from the prelude that equality-oriented societies only ever double down on draconianism, like a gambler who perpetually concludes his only mistake was not playing slot machines for long enough.

We have seen that while white-on-black racism has objectively declined in the last 20 years, Americans' perceptions of race relations has gotten a lot worse (as woke culture has increased) as Americans have been increasingly encouraged to fixate on racial differences, leading to increased racial segregation.

Many woke leftists are, quite literally, segregationists. I've seen wokeists advocate for and instate racially segregated affinity groups in colleges and workplaces. To even criticize such an idea, in many liberal settings, would be considered, itself, racist. I've heard wokeists advocate that Black people must marry Black people, that Black defendants must have Black judges, that Black patients must have Black doctors, that Black must should have Black teachers.

Some of this is so terrible it is hard to accept as truth. Many assume these are fringe radical views unrepresentative of the modern Left. Yet, observe that the Vice President of the United States openly advocated for separating Black students into classes taught by teachers of their same race<sup>EE</sup>. In Chicago, public schools now offer classes segregated by race, in which Black and Latino students are separated from white students<sup>FF</sup>. This is really happening! And in many ways, racial segregation is the logical endpoint of an ideology which blames “whiteness” as the root of all minority suffering (something many American children now learn in public school with the rise of CRT).

---

<sup>23</sup> A culture hypersensitive to microaggressions eventually conditions people of all races to adopt a conflict-oriented victim mentality in social interactions. The idea that grave offenses can be very subtle encourages people to uncharitably dissect other's language. And the notion that “intent is irrelevant” conditions people to be unforgiving of genuine misunderstandings. To be offended is to be strong and virtuous, per Anita Hill.

This racial division serves to isolate Americans from one another. There is an invisible wall between people. Friendships with other races are lost. Society becomes increasingly segregated. We find this condition tremendously sad.

For these reasons, we observe that wokeness has made Americans lonelier and more depressed.

Absolutely none of our work is meant as an endorsement of the American Right. We do *not* imply that those on the far Left are worse than those on the far Right (or the inverse). Things get very ugly at both political extremes. However, we speak lengthily of the far Left (rather than the far Right) because the Left exerts much more influence on modern American culture. Recall that we desire the powers of Right and Left in balance, and that today this balance has been lost.

The next logical question to ask is: how did we get here? Understanding this allows us understand the best response we can take. Is our culture fixable? If so, how?

First, a brief review of the literature on this topic<sup>24</sup>:

Richard Hanania argues that wokeness is largely a result of judicial interpretation of Civil Rights Laws, forcing companies to bulk up massive HR departments and intensely police speech in fear of a hostile workplace suit. This is a compelling theory. Civil Rights law is certainly a large contributor to wokeness in institutions, which, in turn, fuels wokeness elsewhere: as Richard writes, “[many] young people have never lived in a world in which every major institution that they interacted with was not assigning them oppressor or victim status and making decisions on that basis<sup>GG</sup>.”

Yet this theory does not get at the *root cause* of wokeness: why was the Civil Rights Law passed in the first place? Such an act was the product of its time. It would certainly have never been passed in the 1700’s. Moreover, why has it been *interpreted* in ways that mandate equity initiatives and corporate speech policing? These interpretations are also a product of culture, as *nobody* in the 1700’s would think the phrase “equal opportunity” to necessitate the suppression of jokes in the workplace. Observe also that woke culture evolved in countries without these same laws (such as Canada and the U.K.). Thus, it is more accurate to label judicial interpretation of Civil Rights Laws a symptom of modern Leftism, rather than a root cause.

Curtis Yarvin advocates a theory commonly known as The Cathedral: in essence, that society has relegated power to an expert class (for example, academics, scientists, journalists). And in a democracy, these experts’ power is in direct proportion to their success persuading people of the importance of their field. Thus, climate scientists are inevitably incentivized to say that climate change is a big deal. Race and gender studies professors will inevitably profess that racism and sexism are serious problems. This explains why the views of universities all across the West are in lock step: ideas are all selected for on the basis of power. However, this theory fails to explain why the *particular* issues we see today steal the spotlight. Where are the men’s studies departments clogging up universities with claims that anti-male sexism is the biggest problem in the U.S.?

---

<sup>24</sup> We apologize in advance for oversimplifying anyone else’s theory (which we shall do in the interest of space and time).

Social media has been blamed by many for the rise of wokeness. And wokeness has certainly accelerated in the social media era (recall Matthew Yglesias' piece previously cited). Social media drives people toward political extremes (both with the algorithms it uses and the loneliness it creates<sup>25</sup>). Yet the modern trend toward Leftism long pre-dates the launch of Facebook and Instagram (for example, we may recall our recent discussion of Civil Rights Law or observe that Critical Race Theory originated in academia the 1970's<sup>HH</sup>; we may also observe the "cancellation" and firing of CBS football broadcaster Jimmy Snyder in 1988 for claiming that Black people are naturally more athletic, despite apologizing for his comments<sup>II, 26</sup>). Thus, social media may be accurately labelled an important contributing factor in the acceleration of wokeness, but not its root cause.

Another likely contributing factor to wokeness is the decline of Christianity in the West<sup>JJ</sup>. Lack of religion has been historically associated with political extremism. For example, Stalinism and Maoism both thrived on the destruction of religion. Note as well that the *least* religious areas of Germany were those that most readily turned to Nazism in the 1930's. In many ways Nazism *became* their religion. As historian Sascha Becker notes, "Hitler was cast as the Führer: endowed with supernatural, superhuman powers<sup>KK</sup>." Religion has existed since the dawn of human history. The human *need* to worship is baked deep into our psyches. And so, when belief in God falls, people must worship something else: *politics*.

And, while Nazism was obviously a *much* worse ideology, wokeness and Nazism share some interesting parallels. Both are predicated on racial hierarchy. Both scapegoat racial groups for societal failures (the Nazis scapegoated the Jews, the Modern Left scapegoats straight white men). Both destroy freedom of association (even the act of assisting a Jewish person in Nazi Germany was met with harsh social and legal punishments)<sup>LL</sup>. And both have a religious-like fervor which demands absolute conformity.

Observe that modern Leftists tend to be less religious<sup>MM</sup> – often openly disdainful of organized religion – and that wokeness, in many ways, functions like a new religion. It demands absolute allegiance to its doctrines, regardless of fact or logic (much like the church requires faith). The act of challenging such doctrines in even the most empathetic ways is an act of heresy (one can think of J.K. Rowling pointing out that the experience of biological women is different than that of trans women (an obvious truth)). The most loyal followers of wokeness even take pseudo vows of celibacy much like Christian nuns (only these vows come in the form of puberty blockers and double mastectomies). The destruction of religion has likely allowed this new religion of wokeness to flourish. As David Foster Wallace said, "everybody worships." Everyone worships *something*. Without theological religion, societies inevitably worship new doctrines.

We've also seen how the fall of Christian values of forgiveness and loyalty to family allow for the woke social control of speech and ideas to more easily take hold. Furthermore, lack of belief in a God which punishes the immoral leaves people with less motivation to resist bad ideologies. A society of devout Christians likely would not stand for the introduction of pornography and racially segregated classrooms in their kids' elementary schools. They would speak against it, at their own

---

<sup>25</sup> Recall we covered in Part 1A how loneliness contributes to political extremism and polarization.

<sup>26</sup> None of this is meant to offer an *opinion* on any of these things. We seek merely to illustrate that the Leftward shift in American culture long predates social media.

peril, confident that God would guide them through such a battle (or, at the very least, afraid that silence would send them to hell). Yet when the vast majority of a society lacks a religious motivation to act morally, it is easy for an extremist subset to steamroll a silent majority. People who recognize such extremist ideas as wrong are more inclined to do the selfish thing: to stay quiet. No God shall judge their silence.

Thus, the loss of religion certainly helps explain why wokeness has been successful. But if many evil ideologies can flourish under a lack of religion (e.g., Nazism, Stalinism, Maoism), why has wokeness in particular won in the modern marketplace of ideas? Why is wokeness our new religion (rather than Nazism, Stalinism, or some new thing)?

We believe the *root* cause wokeness is the rise of technology, inevitating<sup>27</sup> the destruction of gender roles<sup>28</sup>.

Observe that the advance of technology has caused intellectual labor to be of greater value than physical labor (for example, a lawyer or programmer makes more than a construction worker)<sup>29</sup>. While men, as the physically stronger sex, were once much more valuable workers, male and female IQ is, on average, equal<sup>NN</sup>. Thus, any nation seeking to maximize economic efficiency *needs* women to work<sup>30</sup>.

However, there is one problem: women have less to gain from working. From a romantic perspective, at least. Observe that a man who makes more money is more desirable to women. This is a strong incentive for men to work hard and get rich. Women, on the other hand, typically prefer to marry or date across or up the socioeconomic ladder. Few women want to date a man who makes less than them. Thus, as a woman becomes more economically successful, her romantic options *decrease*.

So, how can society compel women to work with fewer romantic rewards?

Recall that women are more conformist than men – more easily swayed by societal pressure than men. This is exploited by the American system.

American society extracts labor from women by putting immense pressure on middle to upper class women to go into the workforce and prioritize education and career over marriage and family. Women who stay at home with kids and are framed as pawns of the patriarchy, victim to the sexist notion of what a woman is “supposed” to be. They are frowned upon and pitied for lacking independence and freedom.

---

<sup>27</sup> making inevitable

<sup>28</sup> This next section will likely be the most controversial of our writing as we must discuss ugly truths of gender differences to fully explain modern Leftism. Such may be unflattering to many readers. But if telling the truth always made one appear a saint, people would have no reason to lie.

<sup>29</sup> To those who are already screaming at me in their heads about AI decreasing the value of intellectual labor, we’re going to get there. There are a lot of ideas to get through.

<sup>30</sup> The tendency of advanced technology to inevitiate women working is evidenced by rising female labor rates in nearly every technologically advanced society today (also, observe that the least advanced technologically societies, such as those in Northern Africa, maintain some of the most conservative gender roles).

This messaging is ubiquitous. In movies, women beat up men twice their size to show that women can do anything men can do. The men in the lives of female protagonists are pathetic and secondary to her pursuits, which revolved around anything *other* than having children and starting a family. This is because, in order to have a culture in which women work similar hours to men, gender roles which would encourage women to stay at home with kids and be reliant on their husband must be entirely demolished. Gender itself must be branded a social construct.

How does this rebranding happen? Observe the following massive simplification:

Let's rewind to when there were extremely few women in corporate America. When women staying home with kids was the norm. As technology advanced and increased the value of intellectual labor, naturally progressive-minded business owners who hired more women capitalized on the under-tapped asset of female labor. They thus did better economically (and became "cooler and more popular" in the language of footnote 6). Other business owners saw that hiring more women led to greater profit and did the same. Over time, any business which did *not* hire women could not compete economically (and, increasingly got slammed with discrimination suits born of the Civil Rights law<sup>OO</sup>).

Most people think that one has beliefs, and these beliefs cause one to act a certain way. Yet the reality is often the reverse: one performs actions for reasons one is unaware of, and then fashions a belief system to explain these actions (usually in a way that makes one's actions good and altruistic)<sup>PP</sup>. For example, Chinese prison camps showed that if one is motivated by rewards of extra food to write pro-communist essays, one will quite literally become pro-communist (as one will reconstruct one's own belief system to explain why writing pro-communist essays made one good and altruistic)<sup>QQ</sup>.

And so, when big business owners hire women in order to maximize profit, they adopt the belief system that hiring women is good; that women staying home with kids is bad; that old fashioned gender roles are oppressive. Over time, nearly all the cool and popular people support the abolition of gender roles and women's equality. From our findings in footnote 6, you can hopefully predict what sort of effect this will have on the culture<sup>31</sup>.

Moreover, women who work make more money. They rise to positions of greater influence. Meanwhile women who stay home with kids make no income. They are disproportionately part of poorer families. They hold no position of cultural influence. They are not executive on any important board or writer of any influential movie. And so, the women who work exert greater influence on our culture than the women who don't. They become "cool and popular" while the stay-at-home housewives do not.

And the cool and popular women who rise to important positions of influence believe their way of life is the best (duh, why else would they live the way they do?). They thus believe the housewives with no job are oppressed, under the thumb of a sexist patriarchy which oppresses women.

---

<sup>31</sup> Observe, too, that all of our cognitions are connected. It's hard to believe that gender equality is important while all other forms of equality are meaningless. And so, economic elites adopt the belief that racial equality is important as well. That discrimination along the lines of sexuality is important and bad. And so, the cool and popular elites advocate for these issues as well.

And so, they inject these beliefs into the culture. Women on the writing team of major movies write female protagonists who defy traditional gender norms, even if this is out of touch with audiences. When Disney makes movies with women who beat up men twice their size, proving that women can do anything men can do, the writers genuinely believe they are doing a great thing (and, I imagine, are genuinely stunned when many of their ultra-woke films tank)<sup>32</sup>.

Meanwhile, many stay-at-home moms believe their way of life is best. They cherish the fact that they don't need to work. That they are provided for by a loving husband. That they can spend ample time with their kids and nurture them. That they are not burdened by the anxieties of work and balancing work with family life. That they may spend more time with friends. But these women have little position of influence. They are not on the board of marketing companies. They do not write influential movies. They are not cool and popular. So the benefits of their lifestyle achieve little visibility.

Over time, more and more women want to be like the cool and popular women they see in movies and advertisements idolized as successful, strong, and independent. And so, more and more women go to college and into the workforce. Women now outnumber men in college by nearly 20% points (a roughly 60-40 split)<sup>RR</sup>. Young women earn more than young men in several states<sup>SS</sup>. Women have increasingly little desire to have kids, instead prioritizing career pursuits<sup>TT, UU</sup>. And they are increasingly neglecting to have kids, instead pursuing high-paying career.

This has contributed to America's startlingly low fertility rate of around 1.7 births per woman (well below replacement rate)<sup>VV</sup>. This is important because, for many parents, having children is the most meaningful thing in life. Yet increasing numbers of women (and men) are deprived of this sense of meaning, compelled to choose career pursuits over starting a family. We believe it is greatly psychologically distressing (especially for women) to be childless later in life. Deep inside your lizard brain, a voice screams constantly that you have *failed* to fulfill your evolved imperative to reproduce. Life lacks deeper meaning and purpose. This all leads to depression. Yet this shift in the role of women is lauded as an expansion of freedom – the freedom to defy oppressive gender norms.

We've seen throughout how the apparent expansion of freedom often leads to a greater loss of freedom. The freedom to change locations soon *forces* you to be disconnected from friends. The freedom to watch whatever you want soon *forces* you to lose common ground with others. And the freedom of women to work inevitably *forces* women to do so.

Suppose you are a woman from a liberal background. The idea of *not* having a career likely never crosses your mind. It is drilled into your psyche from a young age that to be dependent on a man is to be oppressed. Even if you *hate* the stress of schoolwork and deadlines and the idea of being a constant puppet on a string for a large corporation, you go to college and get a job because the alternative is an oppression you are taught to hate even more.

---

<sup>32</sup> Importantly, this is *not* part of a grand conspiracy to manipulate American minds to exploit female labor. The cultural gender shift is incredibly decentralized. The free market under advanced technology simply grants those with more feminist ideas greater influence. And the sum of many individual actions moves culture.

But suppose, somehow, you break out of this mental frame. You decide you *don't* want to work a 9-to-5. You want to start a family and raise kids and devote your time to mothering them. You will then be looked down upon by those you know. People are polite, of course. They will not insult your life choices to your face. But you will feel a judgement. A decline in status. A resentment from other women who view you as a pathetic pawn in the patriarchy, conforming to oppressive gender norms. Professional women often speak of stay-at-home moms with a truly remarkable level of hatred. A hatred, perhaps, born of jealousy, as a small part of them envies the stresslessness of their lives – so in order for professional women to justify their own life choices to themselves, they must view stay-at-home moms as truly vile and oppressed creatures with thus undesirable lives.

But suppose you can stomach this lower status. Hopefully, your true friends will support you in your life decisions, no matter what. And suppose you find a man who loves you and has similar values with regards to gender and is willing to provide for you while you assume the role of caring for kids, living a family life similar to that of the American 1950's.

Your family will then make roughly half the income of all others in your social circle (with only one working partner). The American economy is now structured around the two-parent working household. The prices of nice homes in nice areas with nice schools all respond to what American households are *able* to pay for them. If you don't work (and instead devote yourself to mothering), your kids will go to worse schools. You will live in a worse neighborhood. Your family will be of lower socioeconomic status. All while your friends will live in nicer homes, send their kids to nicer schools, and enjoy more luxurious vacations.

If you are like most people, being economically inferior to those you know will likely lead to envy, which leads to resentment. You will resent that your husband cannot adequately provide for the family (while his failure is mostly the fault our economic system, emotions are not rational). You will, in turn, come to resent him. And your marriage will suffer.

Perhaps there is the hope that you may marry *really* rich and have a husband who can adequately provide on a one-parent salary. But observe that the sexual market has changed drastically under feminism:

In societies with stricter gender roles, pre-marital sex is often discouraged, especially for women. This because, in such societies, a woman *needs* to marry in order to receive financial security herself and her children. Thus, marriage must be incentivized for men (who will be giving up much of their income to support a wife and family). Thus, marriage must be the only way for a man to get sex (now *that's* an incentive).

Observe that women are often most critical of promiscuous women. When a woman dislikes another woman, the first insult out of her mouth is often “slut!” There is an evolved reason for this. For much of history, having premarital sex as a woman increased the supply of sex and thus decreased the demand. If men could have sex without giving up half their income, they would have far less incentive to marry and provide for women. To be a slut was to quite literally throw your entire gender under the bus.

With the evaporation of gender roles, societal discouraging of premarital sex has thus evaporated as well. Women now have no incentive to deny sex until marriage. They don't need marriage to be financially secure. And so, we have a society which glorifies promiscuity and sexual pleasure (for example, consider how attitudes on pornography have shifted – sexual pleasure is no longer a sin, it is a virtue)<sup>33</sup>. And we have a society in which people wait until later in life to get married, often opting to sleep around in their 20's to maximize sexual pleasure.

The result of this is a highly stratified sexual market. A small minority of elite men dominate. This is evidenced by Tinder data, which in essence shows that “the bottom 80% of men (in terms of attractiveness) are competing for the bottom 22% of women and the top 78% of women are competing for the top 20% of men<sup>WW</sup>.”

This is because high status men now can and do have sex with 10 or 20 *different* women a week (whereas, before, they were forced by social convention to marry only one). Thus, many women (who previously could not have had sex with such a man, now can). Women are sexual selectors. They want to mate with the highest status partner they can (men, on the other hand, are far less selective and will often opt for one-time sex with just about anyone who isn't hideous). If they *can* have sex with an extremely high status, they have little desire to have sex with another man of lower status. And so, many women flock to men of extremely high status, even if these men do not treat them well (as any woman is just one member of an expansive sexual roster to them).

Thus, more and more men find themselves without the ability to attract a partner. There is a documented monumental rise in the number of single young men<sup>XX</sup>. An alarming number of men have given up even trying to date<sup>YY</sup>. This is because the options for men outside the top 20% in desirability are tremendously bleak.

Yet women find themselves in a frustrating position as well. They may be able to get sex easily. But it is far harder for them to convince a high-status man to date them when he can play the field with success, as men yearn for variety in sexual experience<sup>ZZ</sup>.

There is another factor is at play in the stratification of the sexual marketplace: women do not want to date a man who makes less than them. Much research shows that women who earn more than their husbands report lower relationship and life satisfaction<sup>AAA, BBB</sup>. And so, as a woman increasingly makes more money, her practical romantic options become further limited to a minority of men earning more than her. These men are either tremendously unattractive or would often rather play the field *because they can*.

And so, the vast majority of both men and women lead increasingly dissatisfying romantic lives. Many women (especially as they age) cannot get a partner who satisfies them. They thus must settle for a man they are dissatisfied with or endure romantic loneliness<sup>34</sup>. Many men (especially

---

<sup>33</sup> The glorification of pleasure transcends the sexual. America derides criticism of overeating as “fat shaming,” instead encouraging people to be drugged by the ultra-powerful flavor technology of fast-food corporations and eat themselves into depression.

<sup>34</sup> We've noticed a rise in articles glorifying single women as “empowered,” often written by women. This is likely a coping mechanism of sorts. Because more and more women are dissatisfied with their romantic lives, they must invent rationalizations for why being dissatisfied is *good*. And so, borrowing the language of feminism, this loneliness is reframed as “empowerment.”

young men) cannot even find a partner, period, as the dating market is so heavily stratified. Young people are dating less, having less sex, and becoming lonelier<sup>CCC, DDD</sup>.

The stratification of the sexual market also vastly diminishes a woman's hopes of marrying rich and living a traditional lifestyle of caring for children. This is because rich men with any attractiveness and charisma are increasingly incentivized to play the field rather than settle down.

Furthermore, there is a nasty rise in divorce rates as American society becomes more and more fixated on sexual pleasure. Fixation of sexual pleasure inevitates<sup>35</sup> the erosion of the family. Marriage is not about creating a stable foundation in which to nurture kids. Marriage is about extracting pleasure. And once such a situation becomes unpleasurable, there is no shame in ending it. It has become the norm for rich men to get divorced multiple times in order to marry younger, more attractive women. One can think of Leonardo DiCaprio, who has perfected dating to a science: find a young 18-year-old woman, date her until she gets too old for his taste, then rinse and repeat. Absolutely none of this is meant to insult Leonardo DiCaprio. He is operating rationally in a culture which conditions us to view the pursuit of sexual pleasure as one of the highest orders of meaning.

And so, even if by tremendous luck a woman can marry a rich billionaire who allows her to live a traditional lifestyle, this marriage will likely be short-lived and riddled with constant insecurity (knowing it is likely marred with an expiration date).

Thus, we see that most women *need* to work in modern America. The freedom of women to work has become the *inability* not to.

And so, we ask, which freedom is more important: the freedom to work for a corporation which views you as a piece of property? Or the freedom to be connected with your family? To mother your children rather than be forcibly alienated from them. To have time to relax and do what you truly love. And to spend time with the people you love. Similarly, is the freedom to have premarital sex more important than the freedom to achieve romantic satisfaction and have a stable family?

A reasonable person could argue for either side of these questions. Some women are perhaps happier working and losing time with their kids. Yet, on the whole, the data is quite clear: as feminism has progressed, women have gotten more depressed<sup>EEE, FFF, GGG</sup>. This is often referred to as "the paradox of declining female happiness;" yet for anyone who has experienced being forcibly alienated from their children by the cold wants of a corporation, it's easy to understand why women today are far less happy today than they were in the 1970's<sup>HHH</sup>.

It is thus ironic that women are often the biggest proponents of feminism. But understandable nonetheless: the seduction of power is always alluring<sup>36</sup>. And feminism has effectively branded itself as "empowering women," a brand inevitated by the invisible hand of the free market (as we previously explained). While assuming the "empowered" role of businesswoman may increase female depression, this negative emotion is often channeled into rage against the patriarchy. The more dissatisfied women get, the more they blame the patriarchy for oppressing them and double

---

<sup>35</sup> Makes inevitable.

<sup>36</sup> For example, we adore the power to move cities and the power to choose our entertainment, even at great cost.

down on feminism, the very thing increasing female depression (recall how equality-oriented cultures, like gambling addicts, only ever double down).

Though, in fairness, there is much truth in the “empowerment” branding. Today, women occupy more influential positions (for example, deciding what science is ethical to conduct or writing culturally influential movies). And so, women exert more influence on American culture. And in this very real sense, women are “empowered” today, perhaps to an extent beyond any other point in human history.

Recall our finding at the beginning of this section that women are inherently more Leftist (*we told you all that political philosophizing would be important*). They are more equality-oriented, inherently inclined to nurture the weak and denigrate the strong. Statistics also show that women, on average, are more supportive of doctrines of woke culture. For example, 85% of women think a speaker should *not* be allowed to speak on a college campus if they believe that transgender people have mental disorders. The percent of men who believe this is slightly over half<sup>III</sup>. 59% of women believe protecting free speech is *less* important than promoting an inclusive society, while 71% of men believe the opposite<sup>III</sup>. It thus follows that the increased cultural power of women inevitates a leftward shift in American culture, *ceteris paribus*. And this is *exactly* what we have seen over the past several decades with the rise of modern wokeness<sup>37</sup>.

But, of course, holding influential positions in large corporations is only one way of exerting power. There are many ways to be “cool and popular” and thus influence culture. And another primary way is sex appeal.

Throughout history, the male-female power dynamic can be simplified as follows: women needed protection and financial security from men. And men needed sex from women. In the crudest sense, women “sold” sex for the protection and financial security of a male partner. Today, men still have the same biological urge for sex. But women no longer need men for financial security or physical protection. The value of men has decreased<sup>38</sup>. Thus, the power dynamic between the genders has shifted, allotting far more power to women, and thus far more cultural control.

For example, it is quite common on Tinder or Bumble for women to put “no Trump supporters” in their bio. I have not heard of any men putting “no Biden/Hillary supporters in their bio” (not that these men don’t exist, but are far less common than women with “no Trump” bios). Women are pickier with sexual partners now because they can be. Because women do not *need* men in the same way they used to. Whereas the biological male desire for women is just as strong as ever. And so, many desperate men conform to what women say they desire<sup>39</sup>. Thus, female sexuality influences culture in a way male sexuality does not.

---

<sup>37</sup> This is not to say the abolition of gender roles is the *only* cause of wokeness. For example, declining testosterone due to chemical pollutants is likely a significant contributor as well. But we’ll get to that.

<sup>38</sup> Herein we see a common theme: the value of human interaction has decreased. Friendship holds less value when one can find endless entertainment in TikTok and Television. Romance holds less value to women when men do not provide. And, to an extent, women hold less value for men in an era ripe with hardcore pornography and high rates of female obesity.

<sup>39</sup> E.g., “liberal, feminist, LGBTQ+ ally? Sure, I am. Am I dateable yet?”

In short, men and women possessed different powers throughout history. Men held financial and protective power. Women held sexual power. These powers balanced one another out. For every powerful male military leader, there was a powerful seductress whispering in his ear.

It is undeniable that the balance of power between genders has *changed* – that men hold less financial and protective power while women have retained the power of female sexuality. And thus, our politics today more closely follow the politics of women as a result. And thus, American politics have surged leftward, resulting in wokeness<sup>40, KKK</sup>.

Recall the pro-purples/anti-purples example. When there is even a small power imbalance favoring pro-purples, they may shift culture to become radically pro-purple over time. Culture is not the sum of what everyone believes in a vacuum; it is primarily dictated by exorcisms of power. Thus, a moderate increase in the cultural power of women can, in turn, shift American culture to be radically more feminine.

Absolutely none of this is a value judgement on feminine belief systems. Just as Left and Right are deeply flawed, so too are the politics men and women. In an ideal society, the sexes balance one another out to tame their worst attributes. A society in which men hold too much power is not equality-oriented enough and hyper violent. Whereas a society dominated by female thinking becomes too equality oriented, too nurturing, such that values like free speech are sacrificed in the absolute pursuit of inclusivity (this is what we see today).

There is another factor is at play in woke politics: female sexual dissatisfaction.

There is a significant link between liberal politics and sexual/romantic dissatisfaction. Conservatives consistently report higher quality relationships and marriages<sup>LLL</sup>. And those with more conservative orientations tend to be more satisfied with their sex life<sup>MMM</sup>. Furthermore, liberal women are more likely to report wanting more sex than they're having, an indication of sexual dissatisfaction: 53% of "very liberal" women report wanting more sex compared to just 16% of "very conservative" women<sup>NNN</sup>. Liberal women are also more likely to be single (even when controlling for age)<sup>OOO</sup>. Anecdotally, when you picture a woke culture warrior, you don't exactly picture someone living it up in the bedroom.

The conclusion some draw from this is that conservative beliefs make people more sexually and romantically satisfied (and there is certainly truth to this). Some argue this is due to the religion gap between liberals and conservatives<sup>PPP</sup>. Others note that left-wing ideology idolizes sexual pleasure – and when one is fixated on maximizing pleasure, one can never get enough of it<sup>QQQ</sup>.

---

<sup>40</sup> And they have surged leftward in a distinctly feminine manner, with a culture oriented around the importance of protecting feelings. Per Richard Hanania's "Women's Tears Win in the Marketplace of Ideas," wokeness on college campuses is driven largely by women who get offended by language – a microcosm of American society at large.

In contrast, Karl Marx was certainly far-Left. Yet he never discussed the "trauma" of having one's feelings hurt by offensive language. The closest he comes to this is the discussion of alienation, which we believe actually reflects a rather masculine drive to feel useful and important.

Yet we believe that causation exists in the reverse direction as well: that the state of sexual frustration makes wokeness alluring for women. It serves as an outlet to express sexual frustration. And our culture produces a surplus of sexual frustration (for both sexes).

Women today experience high levels of sexual dissatisfaction, with weak male partners who do not adequately provide for them. Over 60% of women report being sexually dissatisfied<sup>RRR</sup>. Such is ironically oft cited by left-wing feminists who argue for the further abolition of gender roles (doubling down on the very cause of this dissatisfaction).

The state of sexual dissatisfaction is typically one of *destructiveness*. For men, this destructiveness often takes the form of physical violence. The internet is rife with memes of Hitler being a beta male. And there is a deep truth in this. Many believe Hitler died a virgin<sup>SSS</sup>. While mainstream historians now believe this is probably false, Hitler's pointless destructiveness is characteristic of male sexual desperation.

Similarly, many believe terrorism in the Middle East stems from intensely polygamous Muslim cultures leaving many men with no hope of ever getting laid or finding a girlfriend. Such men turn to violence<sup>41</sup>. In some ways, politics is a vessel for dissatisfied men to unleash their unfulfilled sexual desires. The politics of terrorists can be summarized: *if we can't fuck women, we'll fuck the world!*

For women, sexual dissatisfaction manifests itself differently. Recall our previously introduced idea of *shit tests*. When a woman fears that she lacks a strong partner, she may make complaints which have nothing to do with their stated cause to test a partner's resolve. She may accuse her partner of only wanting her for her body or not caring about her. Attempts to calm these complaints through direct appeasement (for example, her partner offering proof he *does* really care about her) often lead to more frustration. Such attempts ignore the root of her suffering. Furthermore, they are proof that her partner is desperate to win her affection and thus confirm her fears that he is weak (a confident partner shrugs off plainly irrational complaints as irrational while a weak partner apologetically scrambles to appease).

Now, observe how wokeness mirrors the behavior of sexually dissatisfied women.

Take, for instance, the racial justice/BLM movement. The stated goals of this movement are often plainly irrational. For example, defunding or abolishing the police. This is, unquestionably, a terrible thing for Black people. It has led to thousands of additional Black homicide deaths<sup>TTT</sup>. But this does not seem to matter. This is because the movement is more about expressing anger than about achieving material goals.

Furthermore, fulfillment of stated goals only *increases* this anger. Consider that white-on-black racism is, unquestionably, lower than it was 20 years ago. Yet, Americans perceive race relations today as worse. Some believed Obama's election would placate racial anger. Yet the Zimmerman

---

<sup>41</sup> We do *not* wish to imply that the sexually dissatisfied are bad people. Many people are born ugly or, for other reasons beyond their control, have difficulty achieving sexual satisfaction. And certainly, the overwhelming majority are better people than Hitler. But observe that while a person with no arms may be lovely, I don't want them driving my car. Just as I don't want the sexually dissatisfied ruling my politics.

and Michael Brown protests took place under his reign: racial anger and division unquestionably grew under his watch. Every appeasement of the racial justice movement has only increased its rage. Sound familiar?

Consider, too, the trans movement. Progress in the push for trans equality seems to only increase liberal anger around the issue. Unquestionably, trans people are treated better and more accepted in America relative to 10 years ago, yet there is far more anger about perceived trans discrimination. This movement also has few logical goals. Biological men in women's sports? Pornography in middle school libraries? These goals are plainly irrational. Yet objections to them inspire liberal outrage. This outrage has nothing to do with its stated cause. It is an expression of a deeper, more primal dissatisfaction. The sort of dissatisfaction which only swells with appeasement.

Observe also how many woke policies have the end goal of increasing female mating opportunities. Per Scott Adams, open borders, DEI, etc. (policies supported by predominantly single women) all serve to “increase the odds of women being around additional sperm<sup>UUU</sup>.” What do you do if you're a woman looking for a partner, but all the men at the party are weak and can't provide for you? Answer: invite different men to the party. Of course, this political instinct takes place on a deeply subconscious level.

In many ways, wokeness is the cultural embodiment of an early-thirties female CFO, single with no kids. She is not actually angry because trans women are barred from competing in women's sports. She is angry because she endures a life of romantic frustration. She endures this to absolutely no fault of her own. She has been *forced* into such a condition by an invisible hand which chokes her unerotically. And she exhibits a very primal form of desperation.

In a more general sense, we can think of much of wokeness as a feminine expression of frustration. And woman have a lot to be frustrated about. They are forced to work. They have weak partners who do not provide for them. They are alienated from their children. They have record-setting rates of depression. And they influence culture greatly<sup>42</sup>.

The feminization of modern American culture (and thus, Leftward cultural shift) is also driven by the rise of the *chemical State*. Nearly everything we eat today is at some point packaged in plastic. Even if you buy food from a grocery store not packaged in plastic, it was very likely *transported* in plastic containers. These plastics leach chemicals such as BPA into our food.

Studies show that BPA essentially mimics estrogen in the body<sup>VVV</sup>. This causes a host of problems such as ovarian cancer, breast cancer, and prostate cancer<sup>WWW</sup>. BPA also inhibits the production of testosterone (leading to significant reductions in sperm count)<sup>XXX</sup>. Since this information has

---

<sup>42</sup> It is interesting to note too how our female-dominated culture, in many ways, functions as a giant “shit test.” Men are often derided, with strong, independent-thinking men often derided the most. Men are encouraged to be weak. To be effeminate. Masculinity itself is labelled “*toxic*.” Many men break under this pressure and become an empty vessel of woke platitudes (which, despite applauding, very few women truly respect). Yet a small minority of truly strong men do *not*. They remain strong and independent. And though women ridicule such men endlessly, these are the men they *desire* (for example, Andrew Tate may be the most criticized man among women, yet still has immense amounts of sex). In this way, modern Leftism separates the weak from the strong, exactly like shit tests aim to do.

come out, many plastics brand themselves as “BPA free”. But what this actually means is that they use chemicals that are even *less* tested, that we know even *less* about.

Which brings us to our real point. BPA is the devil we know. What’s far scarier is the devil we *don’t*.

Our food is pumped with dozens of toxins and hormones and preservatives, about which we know very little. Fast foods are loaded with hormone-disrupting artificial chemicals<sup>YYY</sup>. Industrial farms use toxic, understudied pesticides. And large corporations have massive power to control information on this subject. They suppress any and all research which may expose their products as harmful<sup>ZZZ</sup>. For each harmful chemical we can name (e.g., BPA, DDT, etc.), there are likely 50 chemicals we are oblivious to.

But we *can* see the effect of the chemical State. Sperm count and fertility have been declining for decades since the rise of industrial farming. Many scientists estimate the majority of people will be unable to have children without technological assistance by 2050<sup>AAA</sup>. This is a massively deal, and almost no one talks about it. The unnaturalness of our environment is literally castrating us. It is eerie to see erectile dysfunction commercials among the most commonly played during sports games.

Furthermore, testosterone levels have also declined precipitously with the rise of industrialized farming and proliferation of chemicals (see here<sup>BBB</sup>, here<sup>CCC</sup>, and here<sup>DDD</sup>). This is alarming because testosterone is shown to be protective against both anxiety and depression<sup>EEEE</sup>.

Testosterone is also associated with *conservatism*. Studies show that when you give a man artificial testosterone, he quite literally becomes more conservative<sup>FFF</sup>. To our readers (who understand the link between gender and political ideology) this may come as little surprise. On a societal level, this means we have an ever-growing population of more feminine, more liberal men. This fits with our observation that with the rise of wokeness, our culture has become more Leftist and displays uniquely feminine traits.

As cities are overrun by violent protests or as schools are taken over by far-Left ideology, many conservatives ask rhetorically “where are the men?” This is to mean: *why isn’t anyone standing up against what’s happening?* But this phrase gets at something deeper that we can all *feel*: masculinity has declined. Men have been hormonally annihilated by the chemical state. The result is a tremendous imbalance in the forces of Left and Right.

The conclusion we draw from all of this analysis is that the conditions inevitating wokeness are *economically selected for*. Large agricultural corporations thrive on artificial chemicals and plastics. And the entire economy thrives on female labor and thus the abolition of gender roles. Thus, we see little hope of cultural change in the current technological environment (no matter how much you kick and scream, the economy will continue to select for that which maximizes profit).

Some hope lies in the technological landscape changing. With the rise of AI, the value of intellectual labor may decrease as computers surpass human intelligence. Perhaps the most useful

jobs will be ones of physical strength. And perhaps traditional gender roles will become conducive to economic productivity once more (who knows? AI is truly a wildcard (at least to our feeble minds)).

However, we see this as extremely unlikely because every prior technological advancement has caused a cultural shift which alters the human condition to be *more dissimilar* from the human condition in our evolved environment<sup>43</sup> (consider agriculture, the industrial revolution, the computing revolution, etc.). Thus, it would be optimistic to predict AI as the one exception to this pattern. Also, despite AI's ability to increase productivity, companies will still need many smart people to direct AI and perform tasks it struggles with. Thus, we believe AI will likely not deliver us closer to evolved-environment gender roles in the foreseeable future. Instead, the likely future is one with even more unnatural living conditions: even more chemicals, even lower testosterone rates, even further annihilation of gender roles.

We also fear that modern Leftism has effectively restricted speech in a manner which makes it hard to dismantle. Once speech is socially restricted on an issue, it is very difficult to un-restrict, as doing so *requires speech*. And, as we saw in the pro/anti-purple example, once speech is socially restricted, so too is thought – and thus power inevitably remains in the hands of the restrictors.

Furthermore, we believe a cultural shift away from wokeness is unlikely because American elites have effectively co-opted woke culture as a means of social control. And that which is conducive to maintaining power is not easily given up.

Observe that the religious-like nature of wokeness allows dissent on almost anything to be suppressed. Nearly anything can be effectively labelled racist, sexist, homophobic, etc. when expedient for those in power.

For example, when COVID-19 first started, many theorized that it may have come from a lab. These theories were often labelled “racist” by those on the left<sup>GGGG,HHHH,IIII</sup>. How does speculating about the origin of a virus have anything remotely to do with race? Beats us. But in a religion, claims don't require logic. They only need faith. And those faithful to modern leftism largely got onboard with the claim that lab-leak theorizers were racist conspiracy theorists. Afterall, in a religion, non-believers are not simply misinformed. They are, by definition, morally flawed. And nothing is more morally flawed than being a racist (at least, from the Left's point of view).

Since the start of COVID, the following facts have come out: Dr. Anthony Fauci conducted gain of function coronavirus research on coronaviruses in the United States until around 2014, when a group of scientists wrote to then President Obama that his research was so dangerous that Obama must stop his research in the US. They warned that this research could “start a fatal pandemic.<sup>JJJJ</sup>” Obama complied. But this only resulted in Fauci moving his research overseas to Wuhan, where he funded research in one of the world's largest coronavirus super labs.

We also now know the first recorded Covid cases were blocks away from this coronavirus super lab<sup>KKKK</sup>. Additionally, on national television, Anthony Fauci claimed under oath to Congress that the U.S. never funded gain of function research in Wuhan<sup>LLLL</sup>. The NIH has since disproven his

---

<sup>43</sup> That is, the environment in which much of human evolution took place.

claims, providing proof that that the very agency Fauci headed (National Institutes of Health's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases) provided direct funds to the Wuhan lab<sup>MMMM</sup>. This all but proves that Dr. Fauci lied under oath to congress, a serious felony<sup>NNNN</sup>. We also know we've never seen any new disease spread remotely as effectively as COVID in at least the last 100 years.

Absolutely none of this proves that COVID came from a lab. We do not know how COVID started and do not wish to imply that we do. But this evidence certainly raises questions. Why would Fauci lie under oath if he had nothing to hide? And what are the odds that the biggest pandemic in 100 years would organically originate mere blocks from a lab conducting coronavirus research many scientists warned might start a fatal pandemic in 2014? Coincidences happen all the time. Maybe this is one of them. But all of this definitely warrants suspicion.

And yet, most liberal Americans I speak to about this issue appear not to care. This strikes me as odd. COVID was the single greatest mass catastrophe of the 21<sup>st</sup> century – not just in terms of lives lost, but businesses destroyed, social bonds torn apart, children's developments stunted. And yet, many people appear totally indifferent to the fact that members of their own government may have caused it, all so they could make money conducting research.

We believe this is, in part, because “respectable” people were so conditioned to believe that only racist conspiracy theorists talk about COVID coming from a lab. And respectable people (quite understandably) don't want to be racist conspiracy theorists. Racist conspiracy theorists are bad! Thus, even when evidence shows these “racist conspiracy” theorists may have been right, this does not register with them psychologically: their brains won't allow them to fully engage with the idea. Their eyes remain blank. A mental wall is erected. It's pretty spooky to watch.

This illustrates a larger point: the label of “racist” is so powerful, it can control thought on almost anything (no matter how unrelated to race). And thus, we see Western elites wield this great power for their own benefit. For example, the Irish government recently enacted hate speech laws punishing anyone who criticizes their immigration policy (including Connor McGregor<sup>OOOO</sup>) on the grounds that such criticism is racist<sup>PPPP</sup>. Many other European countries have done the same, passing “hate speech” laws which tend to punish speech contra those in power. For example, Germany announced publicly that it would prosecute those who voice support for Russia in the Ukraine-Russia war (contra the official stance of the German government) on the grounds of “hate speech”<sup>QQQQ</sup>. Legislation which fines and jails political critics strongly disincentivizes dissent, helping those in power stay in power.

Defenders of “hate speech” laws claim they are necessary to curb intolerance. And they have a point. Because in order to achieve a state of absolute inclusivity, draconian methods *are* necessary. And so, we see why societies which pursue absolute inclusivity (or absolute equality) are inevitably co-opted by the powerful, seeking to obtain even more power. In such societies, the draconian use of force to establish greater power can be easily justified as *necessary* in the pursuit of equality/inclusivity<sup>44</sup>.

---

<sup>44</sup> It is also interesting to note that a society which pursues absolute equality inevitably condemns male sexuality. To borrow the language of Camille Paglia, sex is inherently unequal, with men typically enjoying more pleasure. Thus, it is no coincidence that some far Leftists claim “all sex is rape:” that which is unequal is inherently evil.

In the United States, powerful media corporations similarly wield the language of wokeness as a means of maintaining their power. For example, consider the media response to Elon Musk buying Twitter. This purchase posed two threats to the media's power: *first*, Musk's purchase threatened to bring increased free speech due to decreased shadow banning (and actual banning) of Right-wing accounts (recall how the modern Left thrives on suppression of speech); *second*, Musk's purchase threatened to create a successful alternative to the News by adding real-time fact-checking through community notes. In response, the entirety of the liberal media, in lockstep, led a smear campaign. Every day, the media dragged Elon Musk for being a "racist" or "antisemite." This campaign has been somewhat effective. He is no longer the world's richest man; and he is hated by a sizable portion of the country.

And so, we see why those with power have an affinity for wokeness: it offers them an effective means of social control (much the way traditional religion can be wielded by Kings to motivate troops for war). It offers a means of crushing threats to elite power. And the powerful exert a disproportionate impact on culture (recall the "cool and popular" frame of footnote 6). Thus, so long as the vast majority of Western elites support the modern Leftist regime, American culture is likely to continue its march Leftward.

The Right may have sporadic political victories in the West (for example, Milei, Wilders, Trump). Yet these victories have little impact on the long-term course of culture. To illustrate this, consider that American culture under Trump was actually more liberal than it was under Obama in 2009 (observe that the George Floyd depolicing movement happened largely under Trump's reign and that few people had even *heard* of they/them pronouns in 2009; Obama himself didn't even endorse gay marriage until his second term).

Thus, we see modern Leftism in the U.S. as inevitable, and thus, a blight best avoided not through a large-scale political or cultural revolution (as such will likely fail), but rather by forming a commune with its *own* culture, distinct from the culture of the larger United States<sup>45</sup>.

## Part 1C: The Modern Psyche

In parts 1A and 1B, we saw how cultural, economic, and political forces drive us apart from one another and force us to live in unnatural ways. Now we shall examine the effect of these forces on our psyches.

We notice that nearly everyone seems anxious today. Statistics show that anxiety been steadily rising in the U.S. since at least the end of WWII<sup>RRRR</sup>. Nearly one-third of Americans develop an anxiety *disorder*<sup>SSSS</sup>. Unfortunately, this is a quite predictable consequence of the American way of life. Observe:

We live in a very unnatural way. Many spend long hours inside, staring at screens. Many are disconnected from nature. Many exercise rarely, if at all. We did not evolve to live in such a way. If you go outside and exercise every day – even for just 30 minutes (which the vast majority of people have) – you will soon notice a stark decrease in anxiety and depression. It is truly

---

<sup>45</sup> How we shall do this will be made clear in the second part of this piece.

remarkable the power of exercise and nature to increase happiness. This not terribly profound as nearly everyone knows this advice as one of the greatest clichés. And yet, despite this knowledge, many are bound by the American drug of endless, effortless pixelated pleasure which is tremendously effective at keeping us inside and immobile. This is because our entertainment algorithms are designed to be addictive. Much like an alcoholic knows deep down he should stop drinking, we know we should go outside more, we should exercise more – and yet, technology addiction holds us back.

Furthermore, children are raised unnaturally in the modern State. Over the last 50 years, children have increasingly lost the freedom to play without adult supervision. Jonathan Haidt refers to this as the decline in “free play<sup>TTTT</sup>.” For many children, every hour of the day is regimented and supervised. Many modern parents seem to measure their love by the number of after school extracurriculars they sign their kids up for. Moreover, modern schools condition kids to be constantly submissive to authority. During recess, teachers often intervene in even minor disagreements between kids rather than allowing children to develop independence by working out problems on their own. The rest of the day, children are made to sit still for long hours, highly supervised<sup>46</sup>. Children even need “to ask permission before going to the bathroom (think about that for a second)<sup>UUUU</sup>”. Children are given a staggering lack of independence (a great departure from how children were raised throughout human evolution).

This is all great for conditioning kids to be obedient employees who sit still for long hours and do what they are told; but it is terrible for mental health. As Haidt observes, a lack of “free play” as a child is correlated with higher anxiety (as well as poorer social development and lower happiness)<sup>VVVV</sup>. He notes that having independence as a child helps one develop a stronger internal locus of control (i.e., the belief that one can solve their own problems and take charge of their life), which is associated with lower rates of anxiety and depression. Children who lack this independence – whose lives are constantly regimented and supervised – are often permanently affected. They are made permanently more anxious, permanently weaker in spirit, permanently filled with defeatist thoughts that they can’t handle their own life.

It is interesting to note that the disease which afflicts our children is the same which afflicts our politics: *too much nurture*.

Our unnatural social lives also impose great anxiety upon us. In our evolved environment, being without a tribe was incredibly dangerous. You had no one to help you find food or shelter; no one to help hear the footsteps of a lion in the night. If a lion did come along, you had no one to help you fight it off. You were likely dead. Loneliness was a state in which one must constantly look out for threats: constantly listen for predators; constantly worry about finding a next meal; constantly worry about finding shelter; constantly be on edge. Thus, constant anxiety is, in many ways, a natural, evolved response to our disconnected way of living. Even if many of us do not *feel* lonely, our unnatural social environment still has a great impact on our psychology.

The modern epidemic of social anxiety<sup>WWWW</sup> (a fear of interacting with primarily unfamiliar people) is evolutionarily rational as well. For much of our evolved history, interaction with a non-

---

<sup>46</sup> When children are unable or unwilling to conform to this unnatural expectation, they are often drugged with stimulants until they conform.

tribe member brought great threat of violence. Those of other tribes usually wanted to kill, conquer, or enslave you. For the socially anxious, a very rationally evolved recess of their brain screams at every dinner party of unfamiliar faces that they are trapped within a tribe that is not their own and thus greatly threatened.

The anxiety induced by modern interactions warps our perception of socializing itself. Consider how many people self-identify as introverts – how many people feel drained from daily social interactions. For self-identified introverts, the concept of the commune may seem repulsive (“a life of *more* social interaction. I already endure too much as is!”). Yet observe that even introverts are joyful when interacting with their closest friends. We believe the common experience of feeling drained by social interactions stems from nearly all of our interactions taking place in an unnatural environment: with people we did not grow up with, do not know closely, and cannot fully trust. Such inevitably produces anxiety for many (often subconscious). And anxiety – even low-grade, subconscious anxiety – tires out our brains, leaving us drained. Recall that our brains are not evolved to constantly meet new people and be plunged into new social circles<sup>47</sup>.

Furthermore, we live in a society which interprets words uncharitably while affording little forgiveness (one perceivably “racist” microaggression permanently taints one’s reputation); this conditions many to *constantly overthink* social interactions, as the social costs for accidentally saying the wrong thing are so great. This makes every day social interactions more stressful, increasing social anxiety. Moreover, such constant overthinking is bound to seep into one’s psyche and make one constantly overthink everything to a greater extent.

I have noticed at times of my life during which I was more conscious of how I was perceived – more careful never to say the wrong thing; careful to even add the “x” at the end of Latinx when speaking with certain people – that I was more constantly on edge about *everything*, not just social matters. At times when I’ve thrown caution to the wind and spoken what I believed to be true freely, I have felt freer in all areas of my life. I have noticed myself more connected with people and less anxious.

This all relates to a much broader and deeper point, which is that *lying makes you a weak person*.

Every time you lie, deep in your lizard brain alarm bells go off that you have something to hide – that your true self is not good enough to be seen. And thus, there must be something *wrong* with you. And so, you condition yourself to believe you are inferior – to believe you are weak. And the weak face constant from the strong. And so, you condition yourself to be afraid<sup>48</sup>. Lying even triggers a physiological fear response in the moment. Consider the polygraph: the vast majority of non-psychopaths physically cannot lie without their palms sweating, heart racing, and blood pressure rising because it is so baked into our psyches that to lie is to be weak and to be afraid.

---

<sup>47</sup> Absolutely none of this is to say that one should not work to overcome social anxieties. The fact that anxiety is a natural consequence of our way of living does *not* mean one should not wallow in this fact. One should not feel helpless and adopt a victim mentality about this state of affairs, but rather work to control what one can control. And there is much you can do to minimize and overcome social anxiety.

<sup>48</sup> All of this logic plays out on a very subconscious level. But its effect is very real.

The inverse is true as well: telling the truth makes you *strong*. If you resolve to tell the truth (or at least not repeat anything you know to be false), you will notice the emergence of an almost indescribable inner strength, the possibility of which you may not have even known existed. You will feel greater confidence. Your relationships will improve. And the more you tell the truth, the stronger you will become<sup>49</sup>. And yet, telling the truth today comes with a great cost, because American institutions frequently *force* us to say things we do not believe, or else suffer grave consequences.

Prestigious corporations and Universities compel us to lie in order to get ahead – to mouth platitudes about the crisis of microaggressions in the workplace<sup>50</sup>, the merits of racial discrimination in hiring, the existence of more than two genders, or the irredeemable evils of anyone who does not conform to the modern System. While these power structures compel speech in a decentralized manner<sup>51</sup>, they collectively function almost as one great force, which leverages status to control one’s speech – a force which we shall call: “The Dominatrix.” We shall include also social forces (for example, social ostracization for speaking beliefs) under this definition. Essentially, The Dominatrix is all of the incentive systems which compel people to lie in manners which support the modern Left (recall the pro/anti-purples example, The Dominatrix is the force which keeps the anti-purples quiet while their cars become undrivable).

Those who don’t submit to the wants of The Dominatrix are barred from nearly all positions of high status. For example, much of what we have discussed here (in the benevolent attempt to help people) might bar yours truly from most well-paying professions. While many individual employers agree with many of our ideas, they are beholden to market forces and HR bureaucracies. They too are beholden to The Dominatrix. Non-submission is often career and reputational suicide.

On the flip who submit to The Dominatrix are rewarded. If you keep your head down and mouth the platitudes She demands (so long as you are reasonably smart and hardworking), society will take good care of you. You may more easily climb the status ladders of corporations or academia. You may enjoy the warm comfort of social acceptance in elite American culture. You may enjoy the pleasure of higher socioeconomic status. On the surface level, your life is made far easier and more pleasurable by submitting to the wants of The Dominatrix and saying whatever She asks in order to get ahead.

From a utilitarian perspective, submission to The Dominatrix is *rational*. One person’s dissent hardly moves the needle: the man who stands up in a DEI meeting and opposes racial discrimination in hiring does not change company policy. The corporate machine chugs along and he is quietly ostracized or replaced.

Submission is *human*. We are social animals. We want to be accepted. We want to be loved. As Tucker Carlson notes, the “herd instinct” is among the strongest human instincts, perhaps even stronger than the hunger and sex instincts. It takes an almost crazy, borderline-autistic person to welcome his own ostracization on principle.

---

<sup>49</sup> Of course, this is not to say you should be uncompassionate. If someone is ugly, you should not say that to their face.

<sup>50</sup> The hyper policing of which tears us apart on the basis of race, per part 1B.

<sup>51</sup> That is, the heads of Harvard did not meet with the heads of Blackrock to dictate what can and cannot be said.

Often, submission is *self-preservation*. Many people have families to feed. Many people cannot afford to lose their jobs.

And so, the vast majority submit and mouth things they know, deep down, don't align with their values. We cast absolutely no ill judgement on submitters. Yours truly has sadly on many occasions been twisted into saying things I do not believe. We do not wish to imply either that you *should* submit or *should* dissent.

We merely wish to elucidate that submission comes at a cost. By allowing your speech to be controlled (if you're like us), you are inevitably forced to say things you do not believe. And in so doing, you weaken yourself. You condition yourself to live in fear.

In many instances, The Dominatrix compels you to *hate*. For example, it is no longer enough to be not racist. One must be anti-racist: one must *hate* racists. And, as we've seen, the term "racist" is seamlessly warped to encompass anyone who does not submit to the status quo. You are compelled to "call out" colleagues and classmates and even family members – to pile on to victims of cancellation with no independent thought as to whether this cancellation is just or unjust. Recall from page 25 that what you say unavoidably impacts what you feel and believe. And so, you condition yourself to become angrier and more hateful, as so many people today are.

The cliché is true: hatred makes you weak. For when you are hateful, your highest purpose is derived from inflicting harm unto others, which is a very shallow existence. Moreover, we all imagine (subconsciously or consciously) that others think as we do. And so, when you are hateful, you imagine that everyone else is just as hateful – just as desperate to inflict suffering. And so, seeing hate and sadism in everyone around you, you constantly imagine everyone is out to get *you*. And so, you are made to be even more anxious. To live in even greater fear.

This modern state of fear is further exacerbated by the fact that nearly everyone is constantly fixated on themselves. The modern State also conditions people to be *narcissists*. We are isolated from others and thus compelled to focus primarily on ourselves. Furthermore, we are conditioned by Leftism to victimize ourselves and to pursue pleasure above all else. We thus become self-obsessed. We become obsessed with our pleasure. We become obsessed with our status. We become obsessed with our own suffering. As David Foster Wallace put it, everything about American culture conditions us to believe that we are "the absolute center of the universe; the realest the realest, most vivid and important person in existence." Yours truly has sadly fallen for the trap of narcissism as well<sup>52</sup>. Even our politics display the traits of narcissism. The trope "whatever they accuse you of is what they're doing" rings scarily true of the modern Left. This is textbook narcissism.

The narcissist lives a very stressful life. We shall exaggerate to illustrate the point.

For a narcissist, his own pleasure and status are the most important things in the world. They are the highest sources of meaning. Yet pleasure and status are fragile. They can be lost at any time.

---

<sup>52</sup> If you fear I am being too hard on myself, consider that I have written over 30,000 words pontificating on the ills of society with genuine, self-aggrandizing confidence that people on the internet will read it.

One can be fired; one can be falsely accused of a crime; one can be diagnosed with cancer. And so, for he who is obsessed with himself, life is constantly stressful – there is a constant threat of absolute catastrophe, as everything he values can come crashing down at any moment. Inherent to the view of narcissism is also your own importance in the minds of others. And so, the narcissist fears constantly that others are gossiping about him, spreading rumors about him, or fixating on his facial imperfections just as he does.

Now, consider a man who is other-focused (let’s call him an anti-narcissist) – whose highest source of meaning comes from his relationships and helping others. In a healthy society, these things are *stable*<sup>53</sup>. No matter what happens to the anti-narcissist – if the bank takes his home or if he breaks his leg and cannot pay for surgery or if he is falsely imprisoned – *nothing* can take from that which matters most: his relationships and the purpose he derives from helping others. Even in the face of death, he will have the comfort of knowing he lived life the right way (while the narcissist shall stare down the termination of his pleasure with paralyzing fear). And so, the anti-narcissist is much less anxious because that which matters most – his satisfaction in relationships and in leading a virtuous life – can never be taken. He has far less to fear.

Absolutely none of this is to imply that humans are inherently selfless and merely corrupted by their environment. In fact, selfishness and narcissism are natural to the human condition. It takes a truly great society to orient people away from narcissism and toward the pursuit of the Good. We believe the primary way this has been accomplished, throughout history, is through *religion*, which we have largely lost as a society.

Many in modern America (especially those of the elite class) are devout “materialists,” loyal to the belief that science can explain everything we observe. Science’s failures to explain certain observations (for example, quantum physics) are purely a result of science not yet being advanced enough: a physical explanation for everything exists, we just haven’t yet found it<sup>54</sup>. “Trust the science,” is an oft uttered slogan of the American elite class.

This faith in material science often has an anti-religious sentiment. Religion is oft seen as anti-science. And as science is so revered – as it has brought us beautiful technology and great cures for disease – many (especially in the American elite class) look down upon religion.

---

<sup>53</sup> We say “in a healthy society” because relationships in the modern world are tremendously *unstable* (per part 1A). And so, we see how the anti-narcissist is maladapted to the current environment (as being other-focused is painful when others keep leaving). Furthermore, the anti-narcissist may be less likely to do unethical things to get money. He may be more likely to defend a friend who is cancelled simply because they believe it the virtuous thing to do. And thus, less likely to succeed.

Meanwhile, the narcissist, obsessed with himself, will do that which maximizes his pleasure with calculated precision. While the narcissist may alienate those who eventually get to know him well, in a society of constant movement and shallow social bonds, this hardly slows him down. And so, narcissism is, in many ways, conducive to material success in the modern State. Thus, it is perhaps no coincidence that our culture *encourages* narcissism (recall how the high status “cool and popular” exert outsized influence on culture; and the high status always believe their way of life is the best).

<sup>54</sup> In a way, devout materialism is a strange form of narcissism: a self-important, absolute confidence that there is *nothing* that is above one’s own understanding.

We confess that for much of our lives we did the same. We were not raised religious. We did not grow up around many people who were. We have embarrassingly little knowledge of the Bible or any religious texts. We are probably among the least credible possible sources on the topic of religion or faith. We seek merely to offer ideas (and will likely embarrass ourselves in the process). Even so, we shall proceed<sup>55</sup>.

I recall meeting a Muslim man in one of the great mosques of the world. We began talking about Islam and he explained to me the concept of Allah as being something so great and powerful He could never be depicted, as no human could even comprehend Allah's appearance. I asked him how he could be so sure of the existence of something nobody has ever seen. He replied that "Allah is Goodness itself. And I know He exists because I know there is Good in the world." This concept is common across faiths. Many Christians describe God as the purest instantiation of Goodness. At the time, this struck me as a rather meaningless religious platitude.

Yet as I grew older, I realized there was something truly profound about what this man said. Because, on a fundamental level, this implies that to have faith in God is to have faith in Goodness itself. As we shall see, the most central doctrine of organized religion is that Goodness exists (like the platonic forms) and its pursuit is important in ways beyond our comprehension. And to have faith in God is to have faith in the pursuit of the Good.

To many, this may not seem obvious. Many view religion as a sort of zero-sum contract: that if they go to church and spend requisite hours praying then they will be rewarded in return with good karma and material blessings from God and access to heaven, much like a business transaction. As most are quite busy, they look to exert minimal time and effort praying and receive maximal return on investment as quick as possible (preferably immediately)<sup>56</sup>. Of course, this zero-sum contract framing leads to inevitable disappointment as going to church and praying doesn't magically transform most lives overnight.

Yet nowhere have we read in the Bible (of which we confess we've read embarrassingly little) that God promises to answer all prayers and make the lives of his followers easy. In fact, we've read precisely the opposite. Many of God's most noble followers endured lives of tremendous suffering.

Consider the book of Job. Job is one of God's most loyal followers and God adores him as such. One day, Satan says to God that Job is only good because God blesses him – that in the absence of blessings, Job's faith will falter; and thus, his faith is, and always was, meaningless. And so, God allows the Devil to kill Job's cattle and kill his ten children. When Job's faith in God remains strong, the Devil finally curses Job with terrible illness. His skin is "covered with maggots and scabs... [broken] open, oozing with pus."<sup>57</sup>

Job's friends claim that Job must have done something evil to deserve this suffering. Yet Job remains firm that his faith was always strong and his suffering is undeserved. In the depths of his

---

<sup>55</sup> It perhaps goes without saying that you should not trust us for any sort of spiritual or religious guidance. *Seriously!*

<sup>56</sup> In truth, this is a very narcissistic view of religion, centered on no higher meaning than what one will receive for oneself. It is also a very *materialist* view, which searches for an observable, material reward as reason for the action of prayer.

<sup>57</sup> In case you were wondering, the Devil doesn't play around.

despair, Job pleads that God tell him what he has done to deserve his fate, claiming if God were to “weigh him with honest scales,” God would discover his integrity. Then Job wishes he were never born. In essence, Job doubts the judgement of God. And in cursing his own life, renounces the work of God.

Eventually, God responds. He asks how a mortal could ever question the work of God – for God’s wisdom and power are so far above what any human being could ever comprehend. Job eventually confesses the limits of his knowledge and despises himself for ever questioning God. And God finally restores to Job all that had been taken from him.

A reasonable person may ask why God would allow such terrible suffering to happen in the first place. If God is to be the purest instantiation of Good, why would He allow for such Evil?

To answer this, consider Jesus. According to many, Jesus is the physical manifestation of God Himself, and thus the physical manifestation of pure Goodness. And yet, Jesus experienced among the worst sufferings imaginable in crucifixion. This tells us that the purest forms of Good involve *suffering*. And thus, in order for Good to exist, there must exist unjust suffering, or at least the possibility for it.

Observe that it is easy to abstain from sin when one is certain to be physical rewarded. Such is not an act of virtue, but of self-interest. Such is not an act of choice, but of slavery to physical hedonism. True virtue is *not* acting good because you know God is watching over you and everything will be rewarded in the end.

True virtue is standing up straight and doing what you believe to be right in spite of the fact that things may turn out horribly, horribly wrong – to know that you may suffer unjustly, you may be persecuted, you may be hated; and still, to have the strength to act on what you believe and do everything in your power to do what is right (which involves thinking critically and humbly about what the Good really is). To be virtuous is to shoulder the burden of uncertainty – not knowing if you may pleasure or suffer – and to pursue Goodness anyway, because this pursuit is of a higher-order meaning than any material pursuit. To be virtuous is to have faith in the pursuit of the Good, even if it comes at your own expense<sup>58</sup>.

There is a great power in this pursuit. Like telling the truth, the pursuit of Good is something which makes you stronger, such that you can endure things perhaps you never imagined you could. For example, Jesus was made so strong by his orientation toward the Good that he could endure even the most extreme suffering, welcoming his own crucifixion with calm forgiveness. But we need not even rely on Biblical texts: the power of the Good is something we can *feel*. Some may say this power is the force of God Himself, as God is the purest instantiation of Goodness.

Yet the question remains, “what is Goodness?” It is not something we can see. The fact that philosophers have argued over this question for ages and continue to do so is evidence that Goodness is not something we have fully grasped. Like God, it is beyond our comprehension

---

<sup>58</sup> Note that inherent in the notion of prayer is the notion of *sacrifice*. One must give oneself away to a higher power. And in doing so, they sacrifice control over their own fate.

(recall from Job that no mortal can ever understand God; and God is Goodness itself). And yet, Goodness absolutely *exists*<sup>59</sup>.

While we cannot know Goodness in full, religion postulates we may know its components, which are extolled through the Bible and the Church. In this way, religion is a roadmap for the pursuit of this unseeable. It tells us that to be Good is to be courageous; to be kind; to be forgiving; to be selfless; to resist the temptation and overindulgence; to be loving; to be loyal; and to tell the truth (for the Devil is “the father of lies” (John 8:44)). These virtues are almost universally praised across different faiths. The greatness of each of these virtues is something we can *feel*, as though the spirit of God flows through us. The value of their pursuit transcends any material consequence<sup>60</sup>.

It is for this reason that the man who stands up straight with his head held high and tells the truth under the oppression of The Dominatrix is an absolute hero. Because to pursue the truth is to pursue a higher order Good than we can even comprehend, the importance of which far transcends the changing of some company hiring policy or exertion of some political influence (a materialist metric of heroicness). The pursuit of truth is great *for its own sake*.

Religion tells us the same is true for many virtues we have discussed throughout this piece: forgiveness, loyalty, courage, resistance to temptation, etc. With the decline of religion, many of these virtues have been lost. Many of these virtues are even actively *punished* (recall CNN firing Chris Cuomo for loyalty to his brother). And thus, many lack a cohesive roadmap for deciding how to be.

Life is complicated. Thinking is hard. Without a cohesive framework for morality, it is often hard to know what the right thing to do is. And so, in the absence of strong religious values, many defer more heavily to rules.

And so, we see the rise of *bureaucracism*<sup>61</sup>: a culture of rules-based morality. People are more inclined to say what they’re told and do what they’re told because they have no deeper conception of morality to guide them. With no larger morality, allegiance to rules is just as moral any other form of being (and gets you in far less trouble). Note that “morality is subjective,” is the borderline-rallying cry of Postmodernism<sup>62</sup> (along with “there is no truth”).

To the religious, Goodness is not subjective. It is a real thing. It *exists*. And because it exists, it cannot be dictated through the rules of an elite caste. And so, we see how the decline of religion allows for ideologies such as wokeness to impose social rules as the new barometer of morality (because when there is no such thing as morality, anything – no matter how repulsive – can be accepted as moral).

---

<sup>59</sup> This lies in contrast to the materialist view, which asks, “if Goodness exists as an entity, where are its atoms? Where are its molecules? Else it is a mere function of our minds.”

<sup>60</sup> Christianity tells us to “be like Jesus” even though, materially, things worked out very poorly for Jesus, implying a meaning in the Good of far greater importance than the earthly material.

<sup>61</sup> That is, a culture which promotes and idolizes bureaucracies.

<sup>62</sup> This ethos is also in line with the modern ethos of equality and tolerance: all moralities are *equally* legitimate and must be tolerated.

But the modern reliance on rules extends beyond political compliance. We notice that people today appear more inclined to follow rules of any kind. If the rental car company handbook says we close at 8:00pm and it's 8:02 and you desperately need to rent a car to get to your daughter's wedding by tonight because your flight was just cancelled and everywhere else has shut its doors for the night, the all-too-common response is, "I am so sorry. I really wish there were something I could do. But the rules say we're closed."

A rules-based society is *less human*. People are less empathetic. Situations are made more stressful by the fact that one cannot trust their fellow citizens to be helpful and reasonable – to be understanding of the needs of someone in a hard situation rather than to be robotically deferent to the fact that "actually, the rules say we closed two minutes ago"<sup>63</sup>.

On an individual level, the loss of faith has led to great increases in depression as well. Religion has a great power to lift people out of dark places. Without religion, many lack something higher to aim for when they are suffering. Many lack motivation to pursue anything at all.

Suppose you are in a very dark place – that you're drinking way more than you know you should and your family all think you're a screw up and you're alone and you have no close friends and no romantic prospects and no good job prospects because you flunked out of school and you don't have the money to ever go back and you hate your job and it gives you no sense of purpose but you can't find a better one; and you know you should stop drinking but you don't because your life is dark and hollow and drinking is the one thing that takes the edge off (though lately it barely even does that). This sounds very extreme, but this is the reality for *a lot* of people in America.

And if you're in a situation like this, it's very easy to say to yourself: well, what's the point of even *trying* to stop drinking because my life is such a mess that even if I do everything perfect from now on it will probably turn out bad anyway so I might as well milk what little pleasure I can get out of life; and this is all very easy to say to yourself and very in line with the modern American ethos of narcissism and hedonism: that there is no purpose beyond the physical.

What's hard is saying: even if I do everything right, my life might still be miserable. So what? *So what?*

I am going to have faith in the pursuit of the Good. Even though I cannot even imagine a scenario in which this pursuit leads to anything other than a life of pure torment, I am going to try. I'm going to actually try. I'm going to have faith in God which is to have faith in pursuing Good itself. To live my life the right way. To be kind. To lift others up. To be honest and speak what I believe to be true. To take responsibility for my life. To build myself from the ground up. To exercise. To get sunlight. To resist anger and physical temptation. To quit drinking alcohol.

And if it doesn't work out – and it very well may not; it may all turn out horribly, horribly wrong and nothing might change except I wind up even more hopeless than before – but if it doesn't work, I can know I actually tried (which on its own is tremendously brave and far more than many people ever do); I can know that I lived life the right way, in worship of God and pursuit of the

---

<sup>63</sup> It's important to note, religion is not the only factor contributing to our cultural deference to rules. Declining testosterone and the feminization of culture (among other factors) are significant contributors to this trend as well.

Good. And the pursuit of that Good is more important than any material consequence. So, if it doesn't work out, so *what?*

So what?

And more often than not when people pursue virtue and take responsibility their lives improve, sometimes dramatically. There is a reason they tell depressed patients to volunteer<sup>XXXX</sup>: it *works*. The pursuit of the Good is almost like a superpower which shields you from depression.

Sometimes, even a very small pursuit can have huge repercussions. Even something as small as exercising for 30 minutes every single day has such a remarkable power to increase happiness and energy. And that energy allows you to make another small change. Maybe you're a bit less angry all the time and your relationships improve. And you make an effort to treat people well and then they actually start being nicer to you. And maybe now that your vision isn't clouded by pure hopelessness, you realize that there are some online college courses you can take for free. And maybe you can get an education and find a job which is something higher than pure torment. And now that you've stopped drinking and started taking care of yourself maybe you realize there are people in your life with whom reconciliation is not utterly impossible. And maybe now your romantic prospects are not completely hopeless. And good things start to compound and you enter a positive feedback loop and slowly the world opens up like a lotus flower and you see possibility you never even could have imagined in a world which once seemed only filled with misery and darkness and hopelessness. And then maybe you have the strength to elevate others and actually bring Good into the world in ways you didn't even know were possible when you were crippled with depression.

This all starts with *faith* in the pursuit of the Good – not faith that some set of actions will improve your material circumstance but faith in the idea that the pursuit of Good is a higher order meaning worthy of pursuit for its own sake; because from the vantage point of depression, the possibility that anything could improve your life seems *impossible*. From the vantage point of depression, if goals are material, there is no point in even trying. Everything is hopeless. It is only through the pursuit of something greater that many people learn their life could be much more than it is.

But devoid of religion, many people never hear a message remotely like this their entire lives. And so, the pressures of the modern State absolutely break them. They are crushed under the loneliness, anxiety, emptiness, sexual frustration, and depression of modern life. And so, we see American suicide rates soar to the *highest levels in history*<sup>YYYY</sup>. This is not a state of human flourishing. It is clear our way of living has led us down a dark path.

But it doesn't have to be like this. Something big is coming. Something glorious is about to happen.

## Part 2: Transcendence

### Part 2A: An Optimistic Future

In addition to physical necessities (e.g., food, shelter, health, etc.), we believe a few things are generally necessary for human flourishing:

First, *connection to others*: to be connected with friends who know you well and love you for who you are and have your back *always*. To be connected with a loving family. And to achieve romantic success: to fall in love and get married and grow old together. They say those on their deathbed often wish they'd spent more time with family and kept in better touch with friends. While this is painfully cliché it also happens to be true. When we look back upon life, we see that it is our *relationships* which matter most. Relationships give life purpose.

Second, *connection to your children*: to be able to pass your values onto children. For most, the most meaningful part of life is raising children. On the most basic evolutionary level, reproduction is the entire point of our existence. Reproduction is central to what it means to be human. Yet in addition to reproducing our DNA, we all seek to reproduce our values. To raise our children how we think is right. And to watch them grow and flourish into people we respect, such that our values and culture live on after us.

Third, *connection to self*: to live true to yourself. To have the freedom to say what you believe to be true. To not be compelled to lie. For lying makes one weak and afraid while the truth makes one strong. Recall that it is only in truth that truly meaningful relationships may form. And it is only when one lives true to oneself that one can truly have self-respect.

We observe that many today are not flourishing at all. Many are lonely, in broken families, separated from friends and relatives by distance. Many are romantically destitute and childless. Those that do have kids have lost much control over how they are raised, as wokeness has pervaded schools and mainstream culture, usurping parents' rights – and has also made many afraid to express themselves honestly. Per Part 1, all of these problems are inevitable by the free market and the advance of technology. Thus, we believe that they will only grow worse in the future (as the invisible hand wins always in the end).

When a society so restricts flourishing, we believe it is the moral right (and responsibility) of citizens to form a new one.

And we can...

We can. We can. Oh, yes, we can. Mark our words in granite stone: “we absolutely can!” We are not helpless. We can *choose* how we live. We can form our *own* culture – our own way of life – connected with people we love who share our values.

Consider, for example, the Amish, who have formed their own culture and way of life almost completely uninfluenced by the modern State.

Despite some peculiarities, the Amish live quite fulfilling lives. While trustworthy happiness data on the Amish is essentially nonexistent<sup>64,ZZZZ</sup>, we know their suicide rates are very low<sup>AAAAA</sup>. They all have many children (over 7 kids per woman in many communities), providing a deep source of meaning<sup>BBBBB</sup>. Unpoisoned by the chemical State, they live long and are healthy even in old age<sup>CCCCC</sup>. While online interviews with the Amish are a very unscientific source, we may still watch here<sup>DDDDD</sup>, here<sup>EEEEE</sup>, and here<sup>FFFFF</sup>. The Amish all appear extremely happy, humble, and *nice*<sup>65</sup>. Without exception, they mention strong community and relationships as something they cherish most about Amish lifestyle. Most live in the same community their entire lives, remaining connected with family and friends, sharing common experience and a common culture.

We do *not* mean to glamorize Amish life (there is much we would change about it), but rather demonstrate that any group of people may form an insular sub-society within the U.S (in fact, a new Amish community is formed, on average, every 3.5 weeks<sup>GGGGG</sup>). It only takes the motivation to do so.

We may recall from Part 1A that people are happiest and most socially connected in small communities with common experience and culture. Yet mobility now separates us. And to the extent we have a common culture today in wokeness, it is one that tears people apart.

But we have faith in a future where increasing groups of people start to stand up and say, “we don’t like this culture very much. We don’t like what our kids are taught in schools. We don’t like being disconnected from one another. And we foresee that none of this will change any time soon. And so, we’re forming our own culture – in our own commune disconnected from it all – where our children learn *our* values in schools and people share *our* way of life. And we will live as we once did: living in the same community for *life*, connected with family and friends, and free of the burdens of the modern State.”

Observe that technology has progressed such that we may now enjoy its comforts (e.g., access to food, physical safety, sanitation, medicine, etc.) without enduring the dehumanizing ways of life which made such progress possible. For example, modern plumbing is miraculous. As recently as 1940, less than half of American houses had flush toilets<sup>HHHHH</sup>. Today, 98.9% of them do<sup>IIIII</sup>. In order to coordinate digging underground to build massively complex sewage systems connected to nearly every single American residence, we *needed* a culture which encourages mobility, so that smart people could assemble in corporations and agencies to work together on complex problems like sewage. And we *needed* schools which instill obedience so that these smart people were conditioned to be able to sit still for long hours working on these problems productively.

A modern commune would enjoy the already-achieved miracle of plumbing without submitting to the culture which made this miracle possible. In this way, communes may *siphon* benefits from the modern State without enduring its oppression. We may enjoy the sense of community and social connectivity common to our ancestors in pre-industrial society, yet live far better and richer lives. We may, so to speak, eat our cake and have it too.

---

<sup>64</sup> One study says Amish are happier than billionaires; another says they’re less happy than U.S. college students; both studies have horrendously poor methodologies and are riddled with confounds such that they are essentially meaningless.

<sup>65</sup> Of course, the subset of Amish willing to be interviewed on video is a biased sample.

However, technology poses also an obstacle to the formation of communes by providing *comfort*. When people are starving, they *act*. They revolutionize. They do whatever it takes to eat. Yet when people suffer psychologically (as they do today), the same instincts in their lizard brains are not triggered. So long as our physical needs are met, we stay docile. Many of us today recognize modern life as grotesque yet we are content to sit at home alone and drown our loneliness in Twitter and pornography (even though this doesn't make us happy). Technology's advance will only make us more *comfortable*, further increasing docility.

Another obstacle to commune formation is the rarity of true self-sacrifice. Any commune (and just about any society, for that matter), will not be pretty in its infancy. There are always kinks to work out. Founding members will likely need to adapt to a different way of living. And they (as adults already) will not enjoy the benefit of *growing up* and remaining within the same community their whole lives. The *greatest* beneficiaries of commune formations will be founders' children, and grandchildren, and great-grandchildren who will enjoy remaining connected to childhood friends for life.

A third obstacle to commune formation is the sunk-cost fallacy. Most of our readers are very smart. Smart people tend to go to college and often to graduate school and have promising positions at lucrative corporations. They are on a path to success. Even if one intellectually agrees with much that we've said, once one is on a path, and one has invested money and effort moving down this path, one is often *very reluctant* to get off of it (even if one intellectually acknowledges commune life as more fulfilling).

And yet... the internet is a powerful thing. Despite our rantings about the ills of technology, the internet has a beautiful power to connect people with a common interest. If only a few hundred people in the entire U.S. are inspired enough to *actually* dedicate themselves to forming a commune, they may connect with the tiny fraction of people who share their same vision and courage and *really do it*.

...

We shall now lay out our vision of an ideal commune in the hopes of offering new ideas. Consider this next section an essay within an essay:

## **Part 2B: The Commune Vision**

I recall summer nights with friends, staying up past two in the morning talking or watching movies. We each had a total comfort in saying anything and everything – deep feelings or the most trivial of jokes which would be entirely stupid and nonsensical in the presence of anyone else. Laughter was near constant and came effortlessly. And when we went out at night, we were each filled with that magical feeling that the night was *ours*. And we knew the next night we would do the same thing all over again. And the next night. And the night after that.

And yet, even in these most perfect moments together, I couldn't wait to *get out*. Like Truman Burbank, hooked on the all-American dream of mobility, I couldn't wait to sail off into the world

– to go off to college and then off to bigger and better things. Looking back, I realize this was all profoundly *stupid*. Because those magical nights with friends in my youth were some of the best nights of my entire life, in many ways more magical than nights of sex with a beautiful girl.

“I never had any friends later on like the ones I had when I was twelve. Jesus, does anyone?” reads the closing line of *Stand by Me*. We all accept that the loss of these magical early friendships as just part of growing up. But, of course, it doesn’t have to be like this. For many readers, it may be too late. We have *already* been separated from early-life friends. But in our commune, our children will hold onto this magic for their entire lives, as our ancestors once did. And so will their children after them.

We dream of a commune in which members live for their *entire lives*, remaining connected with their childhood friends – a commune with social *stability*.

To maintain stability, we envision an entirely self-sufficient commune. The commune will grow all its own food – clean food, untarnished by the toxins of the chemical State. Many members will work as farmers. Unlike corporatists who often serve an ultra-specific role in a larger machine, they will be connected to the products of their labor and connected with nature. Moreover, all citizens will be *free* of the grips of The Dominatrix. They will not need to mouth platitudes they find repulsive in corporations or contort themselves in interviews and applications in order to get hired or promoted<sup>66</sup>.

To increase social cohesion (and thus stability), we envision a communal dining hall (or multiple) at which citizens will be required to eat a certain number of nights a week<sup>67</sup>. Sports, campfires, and creative activities – all of which bring people together – shall also abound<sup>68</sup>.

Yet most central to achieving stability is a strong, common religion. Religion has immense power to bring people together. Many of the closest-knit subcultures of America are bound together by religion (e.g., Amish, Orthodox Jews, Mormons). The common religion must also promote positive values: those of family, loyalty, forgiveness, kindness, honesty, courage, and the sanctity of human relationships<sup>69</sup>.

As we saw in Part 1C, it is through the positive values imparted by religion that many find a roadmap for how to orient themselves in the world – for how to transcend rules-based morality

---

<sup>66</sup> A slightly less stable commune is one in which members leave the commune to work (or work remotely) and to purchase food and other essentials, yet all live in the same community for life. Such a commune has the advantage of wider appeal: one with a remote or nearby job may maintain their employment; the intelligent would have more opportunities for intellectually stimulating work (though most modern white-collar jobs can hardly be called intellectually stimulating); the transition in lifestyle for early members would be less jarring.

However, in such a commune, members would be forced to conform somewhat to the doctrines of corporations, threatening insular culture. Moreover, outside employment comes also with the constant allure of relocation for a higher salary or feeling that one is *different* from coworkers for choosing a different lifestyle, threatening stability.

<sup>67</sup> For if given *choice* in the matter, laziness has the tendency to keep people apart. Recall the beauty of college when you had no practical choice but to eat in the same place as your classmates.

<sup>68</sup> Exist in abundance.

<sup>69</sup> We hope too that a common religion promotes acceptance of gays, who historically have been persecuted by the religious.

which is shallow and compassionless. It is through faith that citizens find greater purpose, strength, and happiness. And it is through faith that our children shall lead better lives than we have lived. They shall gaze up at the stars on a warm summer's night with the magical feeling that there is something *more*.

And it is through religion – in part – that the commune will be guarded from the rise of oppressive ideologies, which so often bloom in religion's absence (e.g., Nazism, Stalinism, wokeism, etc.).

It is also through religion – in part – that we shall establish a culture with traditional gender roles<sup>70</sup>.

Men will work and provide for their wives and children. They will be encouraged to take responsibility. They will feel useful. They will be valued and respected for serving an important role in society. And they will feel a great sense of purpose in protecting their families.

Women will be provided for. They will be freed of the constant demands imposed upon them by corporations which view them as property – and of the stress of balancing these constant demands with caring for kids. They will have more free time to spend with friends and to pursue things they love. Most of all, women will be free to spend time with their children. They will be connected with their children (as will grandparents, who will all live nearby, unlike in most modern families). And from nurturing children, they shall derive a great sense of purpose, for to have children and watch your children grow into strong and happy men and women is the deepest sense of meaning anyone could ever have in life.

Importantly, we do *not* propose any laws or restrictions on women working. We oppose this. Instead, we advocate for a *culture* which values women's connection to their children and encourages men to provide for them.

Per part 1B, status – in part – *forces* women to work in the modern State. To not work means to have a less nice house than all your friends, to send your kids to a worse school, to have less money, to have lower status, to be looked down upon as a stay-at-home flunky. The modern American status hierarchy is set up around a 2-parent working household.

Yet the commune will have its *own* status hierarchy, totally detached from the rest of America. And in the commune, no woman will feel inferior in status for dedicating herself to children. This will be the *norm*.

Additionally, traditional gender roles (as well as religion) will cause the commune to be *monogamous*. Lower status men will not be shut out of the dating market. Sexual inequality will decrease. Women will not endure the constant frustration of being used as sex objects yet lacking meaningful, long-term relationships with strong partners.

As a consequence of monogamy, the commune will not glorify sexual pleasure as the highest order of meaning (as is the case in the modern State). Marriage will be centered around raising children.

---

<sup>70</sup> Such a culture also flows from a society where much labor is *physical* (recall that we attributed the modern abolition of gender roles to the rising demand for intellectual labor). In a self-sufficient commune where many farm, jobs are naturally distributed differently between the sexes.

Citizens will not get divorced when sex inevitably becomes more vanilla with age. Commune members will be romantically satisfied in stable, monogamous relationships.

As a result, families will be *strong*. Children will have nurturing mothers and strong, providing fathers, who love them as the center of their worlds and love each other in stable marriages. Divorce will be low and families stable. And parents will pass on to children that *family matters most*, for strong families are at the center of every free and prosperous society.

With strong religion, strong gender roles, and freedom from the chemical state, the roots of modern Leftism will also be removed from society.

Our children will not have their youth stolen from them. They will not be taught in classrooms about how they are inherently evil or oppressed because of the color of their skin. They will be raised to be *strong* – not to cast themselves as a victim or constantly apologize for their sexuality, gender, or color of their skin but to be proud of who they are as *individuals*. They will be free to speak their minds and express themselves, not taught to walk on egg shells their entire lives. They will live unburdened by the fear that one slip would have them cancelled for good. They will be raised the right way.

Central also to raising children is freedom from technological drugs<sup>71</sup>.

We dream of a commune which bans all social media, as data shows it clearly increases depression<sup>JJJJ</sup>. Social media is also addictive. And it silos people in informational echo chambers which condition them to hate those with differing opinions. We have said many things in this essay which a reasonable person may disagree with. But this is a *no brainer*.

Similarly, cable news will be banned. The news is no longer information. It no longer has meaningful connection to reality. It is a drug designed to *addict* people. And it does so largely by tapping into our darkest emotions – fear, anger, contempt – and convincing us that those on the other side of political issues are akin to Nazis or Communists, which destroys social cohesion.

Pornography shall also be banned as it makes real relationships less desirable by offering an effortless alternative to actual intimacy, alienating people from one another.

Screen time for children will also be strictly limited. Modern children – glued to screens and zombie-like – resemble the severely autistic. What we are seeing is not natural, and is harmful to kids' social development<sup>KKKKK,72</sup>.

---

<sup>71</sup> Society will also be free of actual drugs such as fentanyl, heroin, and meth, which murder so many Americans.

<sup>72</sup> Of course, one may counter, “You were all about parents choosing how to raise their kids. Isn’t it the parent’s choice what technology to give their kids? Shouldn’t parents decide if their kids can go on social media or watch YouTube?”

Again, we argue that choice, in this instance, is not really choice, but the opposite. Suppose you are an anti-tech parent in the modern State. If you are on an airplane and your child is crying, the social expectation is that you *shut your kid up*. Afterall, other parents give their kids iPads to make them be quiet. Why can’t you? [FOOTNOTE CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE!]

We dream of a society which fosters “free play” and independence for children.

This starts with schools. Modern American schools condition children for the modern State: to train them to sit, obedient, for long hours inside to assimilate to modern culture. Commune schools need do no such thing.

We envision schools with far longer recess hours during which children are not micromanaged. Schools which teach children to be strong. For example, *12 Rules for Life* by Jordan Peterson and *The Power of Positive Thinking* by Norman Vincent Peale are two books we found particularly influential for ourselves. You may have different favorites. But books like these – those that teach children to be strong, virtuous, and loving – will be assigned in every middle and high school<sup>73</sup>.

We envision also a culture which promotes independence for children. Young children may roam around on bicycles or on foot to meet up with friends as was once the norm in America.

To allow children this independence, it is essential the commune have a *very* low crime rate. This flows in part from living in a small community. Observe that crime rates are far higher in large cities, rather than smaller towns where people all know one another<sup>LLLLL,MMMMM</sup>.

---

We see that the social expectations evolve around technology. Sure, many may mouth platitudes about screens being bad. But when seeking quiet on a flight, they will judge an anti-tech mom with a crying baby. They may not do so consciously. They may not have the conscious thought: *that mother should have bought an iPad*. But they will be annoyed nonetheless.

If you are anti-tech in the modern State, your child will also constantly be the odd one out. Other kids will be talking about the latest Mr. Beast video on YouTube. She will lack the same common experience. She will not understand many modern jokes and cultural references. When other kids get telephones and social media, she will be further isolated. She will have no way to contact friends who now largely facilitate social interactions through their phones.

She will feel envious of other kids who have technology when she doesn't. And so, she will resent you, her parent, for restricting her technology. Your relationship will suffer. We see that in the absence of technology restriction, parents don't really have a choice. Once some parents start giving kids technology, others *have* to conform, even while they know modern tech is terrible for their child.

Still, one may (rationally) fear that if we set a precedent of allowing a commune government to dictate which technology parents may let their children use, then the commune may, in the future, restrict parents' rights in ways we *don't* want. Right?

Unlikely. Recall that the commune is within the U.S. and subject to U.S. law. It has no power to arrest people. Its only powers of law enforcement are *social* (violators may be punished with lowered status or restricted invitations to social gatherings; the Amish, for example, temporarily shun those who commit very serious violations, but this seems harsh). Thus, the commune may only enforce any law with the true consent of the governed, as enforcement is conducted by *all citizens* (of course, if one violates a U.S. law (say, burglary), one will be reported to the U.S. authorities and be subject to U.S. proceedings and go to prison like anyone else).

Furthermore, in the absolute worst-case-scenario that a large majority of commune members come to support tyrannical rules of some kind, members may leave with ease at any time. They are still U.S. citizens after all. And so, we see the commune's capacity for tyranny is extremely limited. It truly derives all its power from the consent of the governed.

<sup>73</sup> Can you even *imagine* an American public school assigning Jordan Peterson today? Our children read all the wrong things.

But to ensure low crime, the commune – once established – must be very selective about who it admits. Despite our best efforts, absolute stability is impossible. A minority of people will inevitably move out. And new people will move in. These new people must be good people. We believe new admits must be screened for any criminal history.

Yours truly has never been convicted of a crime. But I have certainly made mistakes in life. Many, in fact. As has everyone<sup>74</sup>. We believe in the importance of second chances. Everyone deserves a second chance. *But this burden will not fall onto us!* It is *not* the place of the commune to offer second chances to criminals. Doing so jeopardizes the prosperity of our children.

Admits must also share our cultural values, for otherwise our culture may be diluted with all the values we protest in the modern State. Admits must share our religion, our belief in the importance of family and monogamy, in raising children the same way as we do. And they must also believe in the value of freedom of speech, freedom of association, and the principle of charity.

Vital to the commune vision is freedom of speech, both legal and *cultural*. We dream of a commune in which reasonable disagreements do not destroy friendships. In which the expression of opinions or observations – even very unpopular ones – will not be grounds for “cancellation.” In which ideas flow openly. This includes ideas we disagree with, for we believe that in a free and open marketplace of ideas, the best ideas flourish.

Of course, a culture of free speech – of respecting differences of opinion in good faith – does not magically appear. Such a culture takes work to establish and preserve. Individuals must pass down the value of free speech to their children and grandchildren. The value of freedom of speech must be expounded everywhere – written in every communal dining hall and outside every church and taught in every school in every grade.

The value of *freedom of association* must be similarly promoted. If someone says something unpopular, their family and friends must never be called to denounce them as is the case in the modern State. This is inhumane. It destroys the bonds of meaningful relationships and betrays the meaning of family and friendship. No one must be responsible by association for another’s beliefs.

Central also to freedom of speech is the *principle of charity*: interpreting others’ words with the assumption that they have good intentions. In the modern State, citizens have every surface-level incentive to interpret people uncharitably. Recall how Anita Hill made a Harvard career from interpreting Clarence Thomas’ comments uncharitably. The very act of being offended and taking someone down through your victimhood makes one higher status in modern society.

In our commune, “cancellers” must never be glorified. Nobody must be made to feel they can get ahead socially through the mere act of being offended, for to victimize yourself as “offended” for the motive of status is a very gross thing. Such an ethos must be instilled through expounded everywhere, in much the same way as the principles of freedom of speech and association.

---

<sup>74</sup> In fact, if you think you have made zero mistakes, you are likely not very self-aware.

Free speech will also flow from a happy, healthy society devoid of social media and cable news. We observe that it is the most sexually dissatisfied, the most unhappy, the most technology-addicted, the loneliest who are often out for blood: searching for ways to get offended to “expose” someone as immoral in some way. Satisfied people with a sense of purpose do not do this nearly as much. Because commune members will be happy and purposeful, un hypnotized by the anger machines of social media and cable, they will not constantly look to interpret others uncharitably and shame them for *wrongthink*, as so many do in the modern State<sup>75</sup>.

In summary, we ask readers to imagine. Imagine all your best friends from your *entire life* living within short walking distance. And imagine having all of your family near you as well, with the

---

<sup>75</sup> One is wise to point out that free speech and strong religion exist in apparent tension with one another. We observe that many religious societies throughout history have punished those with differing ideas about God (for example, the Spanish Inquisition).

However, we believe this is not a reflection on religion but human nature itself. Note that Christianity (and most other organized religions) preach forgiveness. Jesus loved everyone, including those who disagreed with him (and certainly would have denounced the Spanish Inquisition). Moreover, the crucifixion of Jesus, to many, represents the purest instantiation of evil itself. This tells us that the *evilest* thing is to punish others for differences of belief. Instead, it is God’s place to pass judgement onto those with wrong beliefs. We may also observe that some of the strictest suppression of speech has come in the absence of religion (e.g. Stalinism, Maoism, etc.).

Per part 1B, there is no such thing as a secular society. Every society worships *something* (theological or not). And similarly, every society compels conformity around *something*. Conformity is deeply evolved. In a tribe, if everyone wants to hunt the gazelle but you believe the zebra is an easier target, it does not matter if you are right or wrong. If everyone is not on the same page, the hunt fails and you all starve. More generally, tribes *need* cohesion to survive, which is derived from shared beliefs. One who does not conform to the shared beliefs of the tribe (even if the nonconformist speaks the undeniable truth) threatens cohesion and thus threatens survival. And so, a deeply evolved siren in our lizard brains screams bloody murder when someone does not conform to the sacredest doctrines of society. We abandon all logic and attack.

However, this human tendency for conformity does not doom free speech. Note that societies compel conformity with varying levels of draconianism. In general, we believe the falser and more oppressive the doctrines of a culture, the more draconian the compulsion methods. This is because such doctrines are *only* followed en masse when there are extreme punishments for nonconformity.

For example, wokeness asks that we conform to the view that there are no differences between men and women. This is obviously false. And believing such a doctrine sets one up for a lifetime of frustrating interactions with the opposite sex. Thus, wokeness must employ rather extreme methods to get citizens to conform to this doctrine (e.g., firing nonconformists, compelling people to cut off friendships based on belief, etc.).

Moreover, people today are disconnected. We lack the feeling of being part of a tribe. And so, our brains are *desperate* to establish conformity around anything. Thus, we attack those that don’t conform with our political beliefs to cling to the weak feeling of being part of a political “tribe.”

Yet a culture which fosters flourishing and connectedness (which we hope for the commune) does not need draconian methods to inspire conformity, as fear is not *needed* to motivate people to comply with that which makes them flourish. In our commune, citizens will not need to cancel disagreeers in order to feel like part of a community. Thus, commune culture will not compel citizens to police one another’s speech as much.

Of course, in any commune bound by strong religion, one who denies the existence of God may suffer social consequences (in this sense, people may not have absolute freedom of speech). But unlike in the modern State, citizens will not be “out to get one another.” And the doctrines of forgiveness and charitable interpretation will (hopefully) be granted to everyone.

freedom to see them whenever you want. Imagine your children connected with nature – raised to be happy and free – in strong, loving families.

We are not calling for any sort of national regime change or anything remotely related to violence. We strongly oppose any and all violence. We merely wish to have our own culture. To raise our children how we believe is right. To live by our values. And remain connected with those we love.

And we can. We can. Oh yes, we can. Everything we have proposed is 100% achievable. Per Part 2A, any group of people may buy land and establish their own culture.

For location, we propose the Big Island in Hawaii. It is known for some of the most beautiful nature in the entire world. It is also full of farm land near beaches. And, best of all, land there is quite cheap<sup>NNNNN</sup>. Of course, you are likely thinking, *if it's so great, how can it be so cheap<sup>OOOOO</sup>?*

*First*, the Big Island is secluded. It is around a 5-hour flight from the U.S. mainland. For a lot of people, this is a pain. For a commune which desires stability, this is perfect.

*Second*, there are few high-paying jobs on the big island. For most people, this is a dealbreaker. For a commune which seeks to be self-sufficient, this is no problem.

*Third*, the infrastructure is bad: the WiFi is spotty and many places do not get cable. For many, this is a downside. If you have a corporate job, it's a dealbreaker. Yet, as we explained, social media, cable TV news, etc. all serve to isolate us and make us *more depressed*. We'll do just fine without cable and slower internet speeds.

The beautiful thing about the Big Island is that all the things which make it cheap make it ideal for our desired commune.

## **Part 2C: The Message**

Lastly, we want to emphasize the importance of a *positive message*.

The values of the commune lie in stark opposition to those of modern Leftism. Thus, we will likely be slandered by Leftists as the *inverses* of who we are. Because we decry racial division, we will be branded racists. Because we seek to provide for women, we will be branded misogynists. It is vital, in the face of such slander, that the vision and message of the commune remain *positive*.

We observe that some on the Right seek instinctively to be the *opposite* of the Left. If the Left polices racism, sexism, homophobia, etc., some on the Right respond by leaning further into taboo discussions of race or homosexuality for the sake of edginess itself. The ethos of this response is as follows: "I'm not a cuck. They can't tell me what to say or talk about. The Left is evil. So, the opposite of the Left must be good."

This desire to be the opposite of one's enemy is very understandable. It is very human. Yet it ironically plays into the hands of the Left: wokeness thrives on exposing and amplifying the small minority of actual racists to justify draconian speech controls. Moreover, by automatically

supporting anything the Left opposes (and opposing everything they support) one allows one's speech to be dictated by the Left just as much as the loyalist submitter to *The Dominatrix*. One thus becomes a cuckold of a different kind.

In the face of inevitable hatred, we must *not* allow ourselves to become hateful in response. We must make it abundantly clear that our message is one of *love*. We must define ourselves not by what we oppose but by what we *stand for*: social cohesion, strong families, healthiness, connection with nature, valuing women and children. Maintaining such positivity is vital for effectively spreading our message.

Furthermore, an effective movement is benefitted always from funding. Nothing we propose *requires* outside funding. Any group of people may purchase houses and land near each other to start a community. Yet this is made far easier with the assistance of a wealthy donor(s). Money may help build schools and other necessities.

Many billionaires (and multimillionaires) regularly fund writers and thinktanks who merely advocate for ideas they like. We imagine some may find appealing the opportunity to literally help build a better society from the ground up<sup>76</sup>. The odds of appealing to such donors are vastly increased if our vision remains positive.

## **Epilogue**

In summary, we believe modern American cultural and lifestyle changes are largely shaped by market forces. These changes are often rationalized as an expansion of choice, yet actually end up restricting the freedoms which matter most: freedom to remain connected to family and friends, freedom to spend time with children, freedom to express yourself openly and honestly. The American addiction to *choice* makes commune life initially unappealing to many: we glorify the choice to move wherever we want, to watch whatever we want, etc. Yet it is this glorification of choice that forces us into loneliness and depression. But it does not have to be this way. We believe in a better future.

We believe that it means something to be a human being.

We are not widgets to be deformed to fit the wants of an economic system which cares not of our well-being.

We are social beings, deserving of family, friendship, community and love. We believe these are fundamental rights. Rights which have been lost. Rights which we shall peacefully reclaim.

We shall not be drugged to submission by the empty pleasures of technology nor deterred by statusists who deride us.

We are not slaves. We shall express thoughts and ideas openly, in a free society where family and friends will not be compelled to betray one another for status.

---

<sup>76</sup> To be abundantly clear, we are absolutely *not* asking for any sort of money for ourselves to encourage our writing.

Lifelong friendships shall not be ripped apart by differences of belief or distance.

Infants shall not be torn from the arms of mothers following their maximum allotted 12 weeks of maternity leave.

Women shall not be oppressed by a regime which denatures them to corporate slaves. Women shall be valued and protected and provided for in a community which loves and appreciates them. Free – no longer chained by the constant anxieties imposed by the modern System – women shall flourish. And so too shall men, who shall provide for families with purpose.

We believe in a brighter future for our children, who shall have lifelong friendships and romantic connection. Who shall be healthy and connected with nature. Who shall be given the freedom to play and become the truest versions of themselves. Who shall be connected with strong, nurturing families and loving mothers. Who shall laugh and smile with joy. Who shall be happy.

We believe in humanity. In nature. In love. In family. In friendship. In community. In health. In loyalty. In laughter. We believe that it means something to be human. Something beautiful which we shall reclaim.

Something glorious is about to happen...

*Your friend,  
Etticus G.*

## Works Cited

- A <https://www.theworldcounts.com/purpose/internal-locus-of-control-psychology>
- B <https://www.npr.org/2023/05/02/1173418268/loneliness-connection-mental-health-dementia-surgeon-general#:~:text=Surgeon%20General%20Dr.->
- C <https://nypost.com/2021/07/27/americans-have-fewer-friends-than-ever-before-study/>
- D <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/surgeon-general-social-connection-advisory.pdf>
- E <https://www.vice.com/en/article/z3n5aj/loneliness-epidemic-young-people>
- F <https://www.elle.com.au/culture/news/the-age-you-stop-making-friends-8322/>
- G <https://ignitestudentlife.com/why-do-we-stop-making-new-friends-as-adults#:~:text=It%27s%20not%20just%20you%20-%20people.from%20the%20ones%20they%20have>
- H <https://www.vice.com/en/article/akebnk/making-friends-hard-late-20s>
- I <https://srdc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/am-pdf/10.1111/cdep.12246#:~:text=Similar%20individuals%20have%20much%20in.that%20the%20friendship%20will%20dissolve.>
- J [https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item\\_1170565\\_1/component/file\\_1170564/content](https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_1170565_1/component/file_1170564/content)
- K [https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/big-city-got-you-down-people-who-live-in-small-towns-are-happier-than-everyone/article\\_5ba1e7a6-45e3-5b97-afd0-23922b8e64d6.html#:~:text=got%20you%20down%3F-.\\_People%20who%20live%20in%20small%20towns%20are%20happier%20than%20everyone.urban%20areas%2C%E2%80%9D%20study%20concludes.](https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/big-city-got-you-down-people-who-live-in-small-towns-are-happier-than-everyone/article_5ba1e7a6-45e3-5b97-afd0-23922b8e64d6.html#:~:text=got%20you%20down%3F-._People%20who%20live%20in%20small%20towns%20are%20happier%20than%20everyone.urban%20areas%2C%E2%80%9D%20study%20concludes.)
- L <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2024292118>
- M [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contact\\_hypothesis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contact_hypothesis)
- N <https://www.unqualified-reservations.org/2009/01/gentle-introduction-to-unqualified/>
- O [https://www.ted.com/talks/jonathan\\_haidt\\_the\\_moral\\_roots\\_of\\_liberals\\_and\\_conservatives?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/jonathan_haidt_the_moral_roots_of_liberals_and_conservatives?language=en)
- P <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9635700/#:~:text=A%20large%20body%20of%20research.habits%20%5B8%2C%209%5D>
- Q [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biology\\_and\\_sexual\\_orientation#:~:text=The%20%22gay%20uncle%20hypothesis%22%20posits.offspring%20of%20their%20closest%20relatives.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biology_and_sexual_orientation#:~:text=The%20%22gay%20uncle%20hypothesis%22%20posits.offspring%20of%20their%20closest%20relatives.)
- R [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexual\\_behavior\\_in\\_animals](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexual_behavior_in_animals)
- S [https://www.ted.com/talks/jonathan\\_haidt\\_the\\_moral\\_roots\\_of\\_liberals\\_and\\_conservatives?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/jonathan_haidt_the_moral_roots_of_liberals_and_conservatives?language=en)
- T <https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/4200480-young-women-trend-far-more-liberal-than-young-men-survey/>
- U <https://cawp.rutgers.edu/gender-gap-voting-choices-presidential-elections>
- V <https://open.lib.umn.edu/socialpsychology/chapter/7-3-person-gender-and-cultural-differences-in-conformity/#:~:text=There%20are%20some%20small%20gender.order%20to%20prevent%20social%20disagreeement.>
- W [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False\\_consensus\\_effect](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False_consensus_effect)
- X <https://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/news/young-women-are-more-left-wing-than-men-study-reveals/#:~:text=Young%20women%20across%20Western%20Europe.be%20right%20wing%20than%20men.>
- Y <https://unherd.com/2022/06/are-women-more-left-wing/>
- Z [https://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/directdemocracy/elections\\_-\\_why-women-vote-more-to-the-left-than-men/44160576](https://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/directdemocracy/elections_-_why-women-vote-more-to-the-left-than-men/44160576)
- AA <https://andrewsullivan.substack.com/p/the-roots-of-wokeness>
- BB <https://www.slowboring.com/p/why-are-young-liberals-so-depressed>
- CC <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2023/p0213-yrbs.html>
- DD <https://www.forbes.com/sites/nextavenue/2020/05/19/why-people-of-color-feel-the-loneliest-at-work/?sh=1c02ff441ad8>
- EE <https://www.nydailynews.com/2019/09/13/why-black-teachers-matter-debate-puts-education-where-it-should-be-front-and-center/>
- FF <https://www.wsj.com/us-news/education/to-shrink-learning-gap-this-district-offers-classes-separated-by-race-394d82dd?st=moqodylycsql4d>
- GG <https://www.richardhanania.com/p/woke-institutions-is-just-civil-rights>
- HH [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical\\_race\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_race_theory)
- II <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1988/01/17/jimmy-the-greek-fired-by-cbs-for-his-remarks/27536e46-3031-40c2-bb2b-f912ec518f80/>

JJ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decline\\_of\\_Christianity\\_in\\_the\\_Western\\_world#:~:text=Christianity%2C%20the%20largest%20religion%20in,2016%20and%2064%25%20in%202022.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decline_of_Christianity_in_the_Western_world#:~:text=Christianity%2C%20the%20largest%20religion%20in,2016%20and%2064%25%20in%202022.)

KK <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/sanctifying-evil-nazi-party-political-religion>

LL [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Denazification#:~:text=Denazification%20\(German%3A%20Entnazifizierung\)%20was\\_following%20the%20Second%20World%20War.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Denazification#:~:text=Denazification%20(German%3A%20Entnazifizierung)%20was_following%20the%20Second%20World%20War.)

MM <https://www.deseret.com/2022/7/30/23282745/less-religious-more-diverse-how-the-democratic-party-is-changing-democrats-liberals-daniel-cox>

NN <https://academic.oup.com/book/28470/chapter-abstract/229099981?redirectedFrom=fulltext>

OO <https://www.eeoc.gov/youth/timeline-important-eeoc-events#:~:text=President%20Lyndon%20B..labor%20unions%20and%20employment%20agencies.>

PP *The Elephant in the Brain* by Kevin Simler and Robin Hanson

QQ *Influence* by Robert Cialdini

RR <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwi-rbyC3N-CAxVokokEHUgVDXcQFnoECBgQAw&url=https%3A%2F%2Fhechingerreport.org%2Ffan-unnoticed-result-of-the-decline-of-men-in-college-its-harder-for-women-to-get-in%2F%23%3A~%3Atext%3DWomen%2520now%2520comprise%2520nearly%252060%2Cwider%2520when%2520the%2520pandemic%2520descended.&usg=AOvVaw2yCLu4d8MSTDGWufdjAB0Y&opi=89978449>

SS <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2022/03/28/young-women-are-out-earning-young-men-in-several-u-s-cities/>

TT <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2010/06/25/childlessness-up-among-all-women-down-among-women-with-advanced-degrees/>

UU <https://www.businessinsider.com/women-dont-want-kids-birth-rate-love-fulfilling-life-2022-4>

VV <https://budgetmodel.wharton.upenn.edu/issues/2022/7/8/measuring-fertility-in-the-united-states>

WW <https://medium.com/@worstonlinedater/tinder-experiments-ii-guys-unless-you-are-really-hot-you-are-probably-better-off-not-wasting-your-2ddf370a6e9a>

XX <https://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/3868557-most-young-men-are-single-most-young-women-are-not#:~:text=Recent%20years%20have%20seen%20a,engaged%20in%20a%20committed%20relationship.>

YY <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/feb/25/young-men-relationships-study-week-in-patriarchy>

ZZ <https://psychcentral.com/blog/the-difference-between-sex-and-love-for-men#:~:text=In%20fact%2C%20research%20has%20suggested,desire%20for%20more%20sexual%20variety.>

AAA <https://spssi.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/josi.12573>

BBB <https://theconversation.com/couples-in-which-the-woman-is-the-only-earner-report-lower-life-satisfaction-new-research-208503>

CCC <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/04/11/how-everyone-got-so-lonely-laura-kipnis-noreena-hertz>

DDD <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2023-08-03/young-adults-less-sex-gen-z-millennials-generations-parents-grandparents>

EEE <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2016/may/18/womens-rights-happiness-wellbeing-gender-gap> ,

FFF [https://law.yale.edu/sites/default/files/documents/pdf/Intellectual\\_Life/Stevenson\\_ParadoxDecliningFemaleHappiness\\_Dec08.pdf](https://law.yale.edu/sites/default/files/documents/pdf/Intellectual_Life/Stevenson_ParadoxDecliningFemaleHappiness_Dec08.pdf)

GGG <https://www.nber.org/papers/w14969>

HHH *Ibid.*

III <https://www.thefire.org/news/2022-college-free-speech-rankings-gender-differences-censorship-attitudes>

JJJ <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-antisocial-psychologist/202104/the-gender-gap-in-censorship-support>

KKK <https://www.richardhanania.com/p/womens-tears-win-in-the-marketplace>

LLL <https://ifstudies.org/blog/political-party-and-relationship-quality>

MMM <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886916310364>

NNN <https://www.patheos.com/blogs/blackwhiteandgray/2012/11/liberal-women-and-sex/>

OOO <https://www.aei.org/articles/the-rise-of-the-single-woke-and-young-democratic-female/>

PPP <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/liberal-women-are-lustier-regnerus/>

QQQ <https://www.vice.com/en/article/paeekv/why-conservatives-have-better-sex-lives-than-liberals>

RRR <https://www.healthywomen.org/content/article/new-survey-most-women-are-not-satisfied-their-sex-lives>

SSS <https://www.ranker.com/list/famous-people-who-maybe-died-virgins/celebrity-lists>

TTT <https://www.astralcodexten.com/p/what-caused-the-2020-homicide-spike>

UUU [https://twitter.com/ScottAdamsSays/status/1750883071635927312?ref\\_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Etweet](https://twitter.com/ScottAdamsSays/status/1750883071635927312?ref_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Etweet)

VVV <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4602822/#:~:text=BPA%20can%20mimic%20estrogen%20to,t o%20cancer%20development%20and%20progression.>

WWW <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4602822/#:~:text=BPA%20can%20mimic%20estrogen%20to,t o%20cancer%20development%20and%20progression.>

XXX <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5242098/#:~:text=This%20study%20also%20found%20that,tw i ce%20the%20risk%20of%20having>

YYY <https://time.com/4289704/fast-food-hormones/>

ZZZ Ibid.

AAAA <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-9305199/49-people-need-technological-help-conceiving-children-2050-expert-predicts.html>

BBBB <https://www.forbes.com/sites/neilhowe/2017/10/02/youre-not-the-man-your-father-was/?sh=4d5689478b7f>

CCCC <https://www.urologytimes.com/view/testosterone-levels-show-steady-decrease-among-young-us-men>

DDDD <https://www.medichecks.com/blogs/testosterone/why-do-gen-z-and-millennial-men-have-lower-testosterone>

EEEE <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3946856/#:~:text=In%20relation%20to%20depression%2C%20test osterone.in%20reward%2Drelated%20brain%20pathways.>

FFF <https://www.openicpsr.org/openicpsr/project/155441/version/V1/view>

GGGG <https://www.nationalreview.com/news/new-york-times-covid-reporter-calls-discussion-of-lab-leak-theory-racist/>

HHHH <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/lab-leak-story-how-elite-scientists-lied-and-concealed-the-truth/>,

III <https://www.commentary.org/articles/james-meigs/lab-leak-theory-cover-up/>

JJJ <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/18/us/white-house-to-cut-funding-for-risky-biological-study.html>

KKKK <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abm4454>

LLLL <https://www.congress.gov/117/meeting/house/114270/documents/HHRG-117-GO24-20211201-SD004.pdf>

MMMM <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2021/10/nih-admits-funding-risky-virus-research-in-wuhan>

NNNN <https://www.congress.gov/117/meeting/house/114270/documents/HHRG-117-GO24-20211201-SD004.pdf>

OOOO <https://bloodyelbow.com/2023/12/01/conor-mcgregor-incitement-crime-ufc-mma/>

PPPP <https://www.nationalreview.com/2023/11/banning-ire-in-ireland/#:~:text=Mere%20possession%20of%20speech%20%E2%80%94%20memes.to%20a%20year%20in%20pri son.>

QQQQ <https://reason.com/2022/04/07/german-states-will-prosecute-speech-that-supports-the-russian-invasion-of-ukraine/>

RRRR <https://ballardbrief.byu.edu/issue-briefs/the-rise-of-anxiety-and-depression-among-young-adults-in-the-united-states#:~:text=Shortly%20after%20the%20end%20of,young%20adults%20in%20the%20US.>

SSSS <https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/any-anxiety-disorder>

TTTT <https://www.afterbabel.com/p/the-play-deficit>

UUUU *The Elephant in the Brain* by Kevin Simler and Robin Hanson, page 200.

VVVV <https://www.afterbabel.com/p/the-play-deficit>

WWWW <https://adaa.org/understanding-anxiety/facts-statistics#:~:text=Social%20Anxiety%20Disorder,NIMH%3A%20Social%20Anxiety%20Disorder.>

XXXX <https://www.harleytherapy.co.uk/counselling/boosting-your-mood-volunteer.htm>

YYYY <https://www.cnn.com/2023/11/29/health/suicide-record-high-2022-cdc/index.html#:~:text=At%20least%2049%2C449%20lives%20were,were%20highest%20among%20senior%20m en.>

ZZZZ <https://slatestarcodex.com/2018/04/02/are-the-amish-unhappy-super-happy-just-meh/>

AAAAA [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Health\\_among\\_the\\_Amish](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Health_among_the_Amish)

BBBBB [https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Fertility-Rate-and-Length-of-Reproductive-Period\\_tbl1\\_365855421#:~:text=average%20total%20fertility%20rate%20of,group%20and%20the%20Hostetler%20Amish.](https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Fertility-Rate-and-Length-of-Reproductive-Period_tbl1_365855421#:~:text=average%20total%20fertility%20rate%20of,group%20and%20the%20Hostetler%20Amish.)

CCCCC <https://www.amishfurniturefactory.com/amishblog/amish-life-expectancy/#:~:text=The%20average%20life%20expectancy%20for,the%20rest%20of%20the%20world.>

DDDDD [https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=2P8MOF7w\\_B4](https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=2P8MOF7w_B4)

EEEEE <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=z6SIJZk5guI>

FFFFF <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=osfDwb9Uc0I>

GGGGG <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/07/120727131544.htm#:~:text=Note%3A%20Content%20may%20be%20edited%20for%20style%20and%20length.&text=07%2F120727131544.htm->

---

[.A%20new%20census%20of%20the%20Amish%20population%20in%20the%20United,have%20been%20founded%20since%201990.](#)

HHHHH [https://www.aceee.org/files/proceedings/2004/data/papers/SS04\\_Panel1\\_Paper17.pdf](https://www.aceee.org/files/proceedings/2004/data/papers/SS04_Panel1_Paper17.pdf)

IIII <https://overflowdata.com/gallery/what-percentage-of-american-households-dont-have-a-toilet-mobile/>

JJJJ <https://www.afterbabel.com/p/social-media-mental-illness-epidemic>

KKKKK <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10353947/#:~:text=Excessive%20screen%20usage%20can%20also,hinder%20social%20and%20emotional%20competence.>

LLLLL <https://usafacts.org/articles/where-are-crime-victimization-rates-higher-urban-rural-areas/>,

MMMMM <https://nypost.com/2023/12/20/news/these-are-the-safest-small-cities-and-towns-in-the-us/>

NNNNN [https://www.reddit.com/r/Hawaii/comments/2pb9mr/why\\_is\\_property\\_on\\_big\\_island\\_so\\_cheap/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Hawaii/comments/2pb9mr/why_is_property_on_big_island_so_cheap/)

OOOOO <https://www.hawaiilife.com/blog/living-active-volcano->

[safe/#:~:text=Lava%20Hazard%20Zones%201%20and,low%20risk%20or%20safe%20zones](#)