

Liberal Oppression

By Lil Fangs

Liberal Oppression

Free Edition

By Lil Fangs

ISBN: 9780463448991

Licensed by Smashwords Inc.

© 2020 D.O.C.I.S. International | Online Publisher

Do not violate copyright: do not illegally distribute
(parts of) copies of this book.

For locations where legal copies of Fangs's books can
be found, visit: <https://docis.international>.

PREFACE

Right now, as I am writing this, the political tension in Western societies is greater than usual, with no signs of it ever becoming less. It is Tuesday, June 23rd, 2020 and the intensified political disagreements seem to be working towards a climax: a lot of economically heavyweight countries have their elections in 2020 – 2021, most of which have not been held yet.

The increase in political tension was kicked off by the murder of George Floyd about a month ago. A viral video in which he was shot dead by a police officer, without him showing any signs of being a threat to the life or safety of the officers who surrounded him, sparked debates about and demonstrations against racism all over the world.

Meanwhile, all displays of Caucasian history are labeled as “racist”, people are actively pleading to abolish policing as a whole and a part of Seattle that was shortly occupied for a physical manifestation of anarchy is about to be dismantled. Things, theoretically speaking, left-wing/Labour/Democrat devotees support and right-wing/Conservative/Republican devotees do not support.

I am writing *Liberal Oppression* to share my “outsider’s perspective” on what is happening in the world right now, to add more content to the “left versus right” debate, hoping to see it evolve from displays of outrage and throwing insults back and forth, into a discussion that allows both sides to touch on why they find the one political doctrine better than the other in a practical sense. This so that whatever future election results may be, the way election results are translated to will not be a surprise to anyone.

The controversial title is chosen mostly for compensation of mainstream sound, but also shows my personal stance in this debate. Because, if you don’t know where to find pure right-wing sources of information, you will likely never see any, in contrast to if you would prefer to only see right-wing sources of information. Now, before you condemn me for my political views, hear me out before you judge.

As far as recently published books are not banned yet, I try to be as provocative as possible, by means of nourishing an “intellectual” debate. More targeting the left when it comes to that because what I’m missing from them is less insults and more elaborately defined defenses of their political values. In this more elaborate edition, the most controversial

statements in this book are underlined in its paid edition you can find by visiting <https://docis.international/liberal-oppression>. If underlined, the statement stirs up controversy by theoretical default. In the paid edition, a statement underlined in blue means that it is challenging the left, a statement underlined with red means that it is challenging the right and a statement underlined in purple means that it challenges both sides in some way. This to give more direction to the discussion I think must be held urgently. (Designation based on experience.)

If you are familiar with my writing and if you know what I look like, you likely know that most of my ancestors were slaves and that I, in early publications and in conversations about politics, used to say that I am a supporter of the left side of the political spectrum. More details about why I used to lie about my political views I share in the chapter about freedom of speech, in the paid edition of this book.

Regardless, I call my perspective on the situation an “outsider perspective”, because most Europeans see me as someone who does not belong in Europe. This while my relatives were never immigrants. Since

family names came into existence (Napoleon) and since (free) slaves were given a last name, my family has always had the Dutch nationality. Before Suriname – a Dutch speaking country – became independent, thus before the Dutch nationality for people living in Suriname would become the Surinamese nationality, my family moved to the Netherlands, another location within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, keeping their Dutch nationality. Compare it to moving from New York to California: not foreign immigration (and no need for lectures about integration).

The bias about race and political preference aside, I am saying this because most people I have met throughout my life have been acting upon their assumption that I am a foreigner who does not know anything about the Netherlands (and who does not belong in the Netherlands), feeling the need to explain the simplest things to me. (Their jaws dropping when they hear that some Surinamese people “traditionally” eat stampot and erwtensoep too.)

Apart from the fact that when it comes to morals, values and habits, my grandparents have not been much different from “default” white Dutch grandparents – I have been raised in white

neighborhoods (from age 3 and up) and attended white schools. The ignorance I have been confronted with (in regard to assumptions about my race, nationality and knowledge) on a daily basis is extremely nauseating. And even now in the political unrest in the light of racism, where all kinds of political demands are made on behalf of a race, light has not been shed on this unfortunate issue that torments many (Dutch) people of color.

So, since I am perceived as a left-wing someone who does not belong here and “my fellow Europeans” are taught no reasons to think otherwise, I will be shedding light on the political situation I observe from my “outsider’s perspective”, and the conclusions I draw from it.

CONTENTS

Preface

On Racism

Political Schizophrenia

The Fangyist Dream

ON RACISM

“What would the world be like, if George Floyd were still alive?” is something I frequently ask myself. The event has set many things in motion that are insisting permanent change. Would *To Kill a Mockingbird* also be (re-)banned right now if Floyd were still alive? And would people also be pleading for the abolishment of police if his murder had not gone viral? (If not, does that imply that the left-wing doctrine is one of opportunity rather than one of fixed goals?)

The death of George Floyd has re-sparked the old large-scale public debate about racism, implying that his – to me unrightful seeming – murder was solely because of his race: an act of racism. This is yet to be decided in the proceedings that follow.

Before I continue, I have some questions for you: should a dead criminal be given the same folded flag a dead officer/soldier receives? (I think not, because the sacrifice is a lot different and it is both unfair to people who put their lives at risk to fight criminality and unfair to other dead criminals.) Of all stories of people of color you could hail to spark a debate

about racism, you are choosing someone with a severe criminal record?

In the Brooks case, the race card was drawn as well. When about to be peacefully discharged for driving under influence, Rayshard Brooks, who also had a criminal record, chose to fight the two police officers who were about to arrest him, to the point that he was shot dead after stealing the tasers of one of the officers, running away while pointing it at the officer chasing him. What if he was not shot and had managed to get behind the wheel again? Though I totally disagree, this event too was labeled as racism, which leads me to ask you the question: what is racism?

The interpretation of the definition of racism that I adapt is in line with Article 1 of the Dutch Constitution: racism is when someone treats a person differently because of his/her race. This, in my view, means that – for example – calling a black person who engages in criminal activities, “a criminal”, is not an act of racism. (When, of course, his criminality has been proven through a process in accordance with the law.) To say that, while the person has a rightfully proven criminal history, he/she is not a criminal, because he/she is black

(and you fear to be called a racist): that is what is racism, if you would not hesitate to call a white criminal “a criminal”. Do not treat someone different because of his/her race, otherwise you are a racist.

The anti-racism and anti-discrimination law in the Dutch Constitution has been a systematic contribution to the fight against racism and discrimination (after 1983). Something people of color, in the context of history, share with certain other ethnic and ideological groups of people is that their lives have been tormented by people acting upon the belief that they were superior over them.

Because once upon a time the awful misconception that people of color were not to be considered humans had the upper hand, causing them to not have the right to own possessions, to be harmed without the right for justice and other forms of mistreatment they would not have suffered if their race were different. The dark pages of human history. (Though I do not support the identitylessness of communism, is there no slight correlation between the dark pages of history and the existence of capitalism?)

Speaking from experience, there are still people walking this Earth with the same conviction of

them being superior because of their race and/or the things they believe in. The – in my view – racist, highly offensive disease that must be exterminated. So when an anti-racism narrative is spun, the people blinded by thinking in black and white would be trained not to see color, wouldn't you think? Why is the reality of the anti-racism narrative so much different? I bet they are worsened now: the assumptions of the people who see me as some illegal alien who does not know how to use a spoon, by permitting vandalism on a large scale, in the name of anti-racism, their assumptions are worsened now, I bet. They will never understand.

A few sections back, I described some of my ethnic history. Does that make me a racist? According to the left, it does. Because all displays of history that refer to the dark pages of history (of people of color) are now marked as hateful displays of racism. (Even when they include a contribution to the freedom of people of color in Western societies and former colonies.)

It is as if they are attempting to erase the past. While they can never erase what has happened (unless they say that all historic figures are made up people), by taking it out of public and private

conversations by illegalizing it, the path towards mutual understanding becomes a lot longer. (An example of liberal oppression.) If they succeed in their process of the illegalization of history, real racists will never learn to see people of color as ethnically (physically AND MENTALLY) equal human beings.

Where I'd want the discussion about racism to be about incorrect assumptions related to race, the discussion is about punishing Caucasians for their history (and their conservative values). As if today's Caucasians could choose what their history was, first of all.

It has become a very stupid discussion, in my opinion. Because instead of pushing through the final steps that need to be made in regard to equal opportunities in some communities and mutual understanding worldwide, what is pushed through now is some odd form of oppressive liberal overcompensation in the name of black people.

A lot of people (of all races, what a plus) are freely permitted to show their most sadistic sides, in what they proclaim as "anti-racism". I have seen videos of public and private property being defaced and burned, people with authority not doing their

jobs because they fear the consequences of being disliked, and Caucasians being forced to kneel and do other submissive things because of their race. The combination of threat and submission makes me sick. (When I said that I want to see Caucasian men (among all other people, but highlighted in the light of attractiveness that is underacknowledged in the light of defamed gender and race) kneel for me, I meant that as the acknowledgement of my superior individual status and intellect, as their Regentesse.)

What is permitted in society right now is the most racist happening since the Second World War. Because, applying the definition of racism I described earlier, now Caucasians are shamed for the color of their skin, which is racism. And Caucasians who rightfully refuse to acknowledge that they should be ashamed for the race they are born with, are shamed by other Caucasians who do somehow easily adopt this form of submission. This is disgusting. No one alive today is to blame for what happened starting hundreds of years ago. To punish people for something they are not personally responsible for is extremely irrational.

To read that the first black Belgian mayor wants government officials to apologize for slavery is

extremely concerning to me. Our race has come such a long way from not even being allowed to choose when to rest, to legally being allowed equal career chances among the people whose ancestors once followed the misconception that oppressed us. What merit will apologies, for something they are not personally responsible for, bring? I don't know about yours, but this is not what my ancestors have fought for. Today's political unrest is a disgrace.

This "pro black, anti-white" rebellion must not be mistaken for my statement about getting rid of the present-day elite in power. The liberal elite is only making things worse. Future working class generations are brainwashed with largely unproven theories (served as facts), the overall standards, morals and values that are served to the public are dysfunctional, they drain people's wealth and they deliver absolutely nothing valuable in return. So I say there must be a new elite, which must include me. Change my mind.

My disapproval of today's elite is sparked by the fact that they, in their propaganda, tell people how to treat people of other races and "facts" about people of other races, while they should be speaking only for themselves, because they are not superior and they

clearly (based on what they propagate) have no idea what people of other races actually want and what people of other races are actually like. They are, when it comes to the daily acts of being a human being, not as different as their propaganda insinuates.

What I observe in the propaganda of the liberal elite, is that it teaches people to judge a race by comparing it to other races statistically. It is more focused on highlighting the differences between people than pointing out the fact by default someone's race does not make him/her different than someone from another race. Racists.

Something I adopted from back in the day when I used to believe the mainstream media, was that I was under the impression that in the United States, dozens of colored people are unrightfully shot dead by police officers. This is far from true. On average, it is not more than 20 people a year. Don't get me wrong, it is still unfortunate that it happens, but it definitely raises questions against people creating the impression that Caucasian police officers are targeting a specific race group to annihilate them for no reason, is setting up people against each other for no good reason.

Instead of lying about the living circumstances of African Americans, what should have been getting more attention is that, while every US citizen has the right to a fair trial, when an American citizen of color murders another American citizen of color, not much seems to happen for justice and making sure that that pattern ceases to exist. In reference to those who portray this unfortunate happening as something that is related to race: this is a location-based community problem, not a racial problem. It could perhaps be solved by making it easier to anonymously report crime. Because crime has nothing to do with culture. Those who are convinced of that have a problem with understanding the purpose of mankind.

What disturbs me the most about the anti-racism propaganda that is spread worldwide lately, like a pandemic, is that it gives the impression that the legal and economic structure of Western countries is formed in such a way that it purposely disadvantages colored people. As if we are still living in the 1600s. This is not true. There is no oppression.

According to the law and/or according to the international social standard (what applies depends

on where you live), it is illegal to prohibit someone to own something or achieve something because of his or her race. In this same way, it is illegal for someone specialized in law enforcement to kill a colored person and get away with that without a fair trial. (To shoot any person with a severe criminal history, who has not hesitated to attack a police officer, does not at all sound like a hate crime to me.) Systemic racism, or institutional racism, are thus in its theoretic sense not real.

What does negatively impact people of color is what I will call “silent racism”. Because in environments where colored people live directly among (many) Caucasians and among people with legislative authority, the conviction of some Caucasians that people of color are cognitively lesser beings, shines through without any restrictions.

In this way, speaking from experience, using weak argumentation, applying a double standard, a Caucasian is still able to prohibit a colored person from owning or achieving something he/she would have allowed a Caucasian with the same profile. This gives the impression of systematic racism, but it is in fact silent racism caused by the defective nature of the individual exercising it.

Silent racism also includes purposely offensive racist remarks, such as Republican senator Tim Scott being refused the passage of a perfect bill that would have helped troubled communities a lot, without any proper argumentation as to what made the bill imperfect in their eyes, being called “token”. (Comparable to the role of joker in a card game.) When I, in a recent blog post, wrote that if someone responds to racism with physical violence, that should be considered a legitimate consequence because otherwise racists will never learn, I was talking about silent racism and not about being proud of your country.

If, instead of tearing down statues of abolitionists, the anti-racism propaganda campaign would address that kind of day-to-day racism, we would actually be getting somewhere. But the problem with racists is that they do not see that they are racists (until it is too late). Speaking from my personal experience of 23 years of daily life, most silent racists are to be found on the left side of the political spectrum.

When I saw that the public debate about racism was kicked off, I regained hope for seeing an end to silent racism. But instead, every day, I am more surprised by how dumb the average human being is.

And when I say the average human being, I am, of course, referring to all races. People are really convinced that by taking away some statues they are performing some positively historic prophetic miracle that is improving the lives of colored people who are oppressed. While in fact they are making a fool of themselves and sane people are stressed out contemplating how to make sure that they will never get their hands on power (again).

Seriously, I have dealt with extremely hurtful kinds of racism in my 23 years of being alive, so I'm all about real anti-racism. But this oppressive liberal anti-racism is so insane that I don't understand how people can take it seriously. They are now taking down statues of people who are not directly affiliated with racism. But even if there was a statue of a slave hanging from a tree, or a statue of Adolph Hitler: I would not be offended by it. It is a depiction of history. Seeing that, for example during a walk through the park, could remind us of how our ancestors have fought for our freedom, and could add more insight to what we need to do to maintain and improve our quality of life. Even for a memory so cruel: try to look at the bright side of things (instead of playing the victim).

If you really want to tackle racism, why not organize legit public debates in which people can actually learn about real occurrences of racism? And why are anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination not included in the public debate? This feels unfair to me.

With the debate about racism, in the Netherlands and in Belgium, the debate about Zwarte Piet emerges. Sinterklaas is a traditional holiday in the Netherlands, Belgium and (former) Dutch colonies in the Caribbean (including Suriname). He is the predecessor of Santa Claus. Imagine if Santa's little helpers had to be blackfaced mandatorily. That is what the Zwarte Piet debate is about.

In the Caribbean, there is no emphasis on the skin tone of Zwarte Piet. In Europe, blackfacing Sinterklaas his helpers is, mostly by conservatives, considered a mandatory part of the tradition. Something a lot of people, including I, are not a fan of. Is Zwarte Piet a display of racism?

If you look at Zwarte Piet solely as a character in a made up story and dressing up as this person, it does not necessarily have to be considered offensive.

That would be like me saying that I want to dress up as Marvel's Mystique and painting myself blue.

But when you are speaking of traditions that are associated with a country and its values, a country with a (very rich) slavery related history, with people of color born there who did not choose to be born there, when a character that evidently plays the role of a slave is "traditionally" blackfaced and that is considered offensive to some, why make such a big deal out of it? Why not just simply end the "mandatory" face paint on Sinterklaas as a whole? I thought you were all about inclusiveness? Blackface was not even part of the original tradition? Isn't face paint of rather negative influence, in contrast to being of positive influence, to the skin?

If you want to teach children an indirect lesson, let it be for them to appreciate all skin colors equally, hence throughout the countries all Dutch/Belgian children of all races are dressed in their Piet outfits, without any face paint. The, in contrast to "we used to own slaves", new underlying message: in this capitalist world, we are all slaves. (Happy?) (And if you want to continue to be stubborn about this, then at least give me the opportunity to not be confronted with the horrible sight of Zwarte Piet, by creating Piet-free zones.) Blackfacing is, in my opinion,

extremely ugly anyway. I don't understand why you'd want to do that to yourself and not see that you are making a fool of yourself.

I have heard a lot of people say that when it comes to racism and stigmatization, the United States are worse than the Netherlands. The problems that communities that mostly consist of people of color face in the United States are statistically less prevalent in the Netherlands: that is true. But I think that when it comes to the overall understanding that some/most people of color are national (“Westernized”) citizens as well, is better understood in the United States than it is in the Netherlands, speaking from experience. I don't see people in the United States have an endless *Zwarte Piet* debate. Also, I don't think it would be acceptable to tell someone: “You are the nicest n***** in this country,” on national television and just accept that that kind of racist language is normalized. But sure, there is plenty of room for disagreement.

In regard to, “(If you don't like it here then) go back to Africa,” statements I have heard too often when my critique is taken out of context: if you are mad about someone from Africa moving to your country, be mad at the politicians who are making

that possible and not at the person doing what is possible. If you have a problem with me being born with the Dutch nationality, you should be mad at your ancestors and not mad at me. As if I had a choice. (For me, in the context of my nationality, there is no “going back to...”. (And sure, if it were possible, I’d gladly go back to my roots, have a nice house built and abandon this liberal mess for good.))

If a person has the choice to move to a different country and adapt its nationality, then spits on everything the country stands for and never wants to associate himself/herself with the national citizens, I do sympathize with: “Go back to where you came from.” Something I, in some places, would not dare to say out loud (yet), though. More about that in the next chapter.

When it comes to my own position in this debate – this is a little digression – growing up, though my skin is relatively light in comparison to other colored people, I always considered myself 100% black. This because the same goes for my parents. Or the people who claimed the roles of parents for me. Later, seeing that not only my skin tone makes me look different from most people in my environment, but my general features as well, I started to think that my actual

father, who I do not know as my father, could be a Caucasian man. When I describe my origin, I often don't mention the uncertainty, because explaining that as well would add more time to "mainly Surinamese Creole, Dutch Surinamese and Surinamese Amerindian" (in contrast to someone naming just one race), which I find uncomfortable when I sense the attention span of most people.

"Some people in this country will despise you because of the color of your skin. Keep in mind that you will have to work twice as hard to be successful," is (my grandmother's) mantra I grew up with. Initially causing me to, with the awareness of my ancestry, feel like every white person looks down on black people. As I grew older, my prejudice had been confirmed too often, but I learnt that there are non-black people who do value equality as well.

In conversations about racism, when I tell a colored person about my experiences with racism, he/she often tells me that my skin is not that dark and that it would have been worse if my skin were darker. This causes me to not only be socially marginalized among the racist white people to whom I am "the blackest person they have ever seen", I am marginalized among black people as well. And on top of that there are the "woke" white people who feel

they are in the position to speak on behalf of a black person, pointing out my light skin. So here, again, I am speaking from an “outsider’s perspective”.

To make sure that my explanation of what I consider the real definition of racism and its interpretation, opposite to the liberal interpretation of the word racism, has landed, I will give you some examples of what should be labeled as “racism” and what should not be labeled as “racism”.

Example 1: A colored person is shot dead after threatening an officer with what is legally considered a deadly weapon. – This is not racism.

Example 2: A colored person is shot dead while peacefully minding his/her own business and not being a threat to anyone. – This could be racism, depending on the motives of the shooter.

Example 3: A colored person lights a store on fire by means of symbolically making an anti-racism statement. The person is prosecuted for doing this. – This is not racism, because the person has broken the law.

Example 4: A colored person lights a store on fire by means of symbolically making an anti-racism statement. The person is not prosecuted for doing

this, because it was done in the name of anti-racism.

– This is racism, because if it were done by a Caucasian for whatever “justified reason”, he or she would be prosecuted for it.

Example 5: A colored person from a specific neighborhood may not choose what school to attend.

– This is racism, because people of other races are allowed to make the choice.

Example 6: A person from a specific neighborhood may not choose what school to attend.

– This is not racism, but it is discrimination.

Different from misjudgment based on race, the person is now treated different because of where he/she lives, which is also illegal in the context of equal human rights.

Example 7: A colored person is offered free fast food by a Caucasian person, by means of apologizing for the deeds of his/her ancestors. - This is racism towards the person of color, because it is treating someone different because of his/her skin tone. (And why fast food?)

Example 8: A Caucasian person says: “I wish the dark pages of human history did not exist.” – This is not racism. This is an opinion people who are

not sadistic racists have. Unfortunately we cannot change the past, and without the past we would not have the beautiful multi-ethnic countries we know today. (Not saying that we now need to over-exaggerate multi-ethnicity by purposely importing illegal immigrants. (But before further condemnation please read the next chapter.))

Example 9: A Caucasian person says: “I want to take a picture with the statue of Columbus, because I love the United States.” – This is not racism. The United States is (or are) (in the course of history, like other Western countries, flourished into) a diverse country that legally pursues freedom regardless of race or gender. (I will get to beliefs in later chapters.)

Example 10: A Caucasian says: “I want to get a tan, but not too much because I don’t want to look like a n****r.” – This is extremely offensive (so when there is a chance of a person of color seeing/hearing it, you keep it to yourself) and racist because liking a tan but disliking people of color do not go hand in hand. There is nothing wrong with the natural appearance of a person of color.

Example 11: A colored person says: “Apologize for what your ancestors have done.” – This is racism.

No one chooses their ancestors, so there is no reason to apologize for it.

Example 12: A presidential candidate tells a person of color: “If you don’t vote for me, then you *ain’t* black.” – This is both racism and an irrational pressure towards colored voters. Everyone has the fully independent right to choose the side of the spectrum that he/she thinks will benefit him/her the most. To assume otherwise is racism/discrimination. On top of that, to consciously adopt a different use of language around a person of color is treating a person differently because of his/her race, thus is racism.

Example 13: I just enjoyed eating Belgian *stoofvlees* because I live in Belgium now and I want to submerge myself into Belgian traditions. – This is not racism and this is not discrimination. Someone has marked “cultural appropriation” as something shameful and illegal. I wonder who and why, because personally, I would be extremely happy to see Caucasian Dutch people dressed in traditional Surinamese clothing. In that way at least I’d see some sign of them knowing about their colonial history. (In contrast to the ignorance I have been confronted with too often.)

Example 14: Someone says, “Zwarte Piet is racism.” – This is controversial. Viewed separately as a character in a story, Zwarte Piet is simply a character in a story and not a purposely offensive display of racism. But when labeled as “of high value to a national tradition” only when this character, that in its status, behavior and clothing evidently is a slave, is blackfaced, while there are people born with the nationality of the designated country(s) saying that they feel offended by this particular aspect of the tradition and this is left unacknowledged: that is racism. If the traditional food “negerzoenen” can be renamed to the neutral “zoenen”, why can’t “Zwarte Piet” become the neutral “Piet”? (All we’ve ever wanted was equality...)

Example 15: A (white) Dutch person says, “(White) Belgians are stupid.” – This is not racism, because (white) Dutch people and (white) Belgians are both Caucasians, but it is a very ignorant form of discrimination, because someone’s level of intelligence is not determined by on what side of the border he/she was born.

Example 16: A teacher of a colored person who is evidently a lot more intelligent than his/her classmates, uses a double standard to grade his/her

work. – This is not necessarily racism, depending on the teacher's further motives for using a double standard, but it is an unfair form of discrimination (in contrast, price discrimination in the context of taxes, for example, is a fair form of discrimination) because even though higher intelligence distinguishes someone's ability to know, adapt and create, someone with high intelligence still only has the same resources as his/her classmates to prepare for the test, so to treat him/her differently is unfair.

POLITICAL SCHIZOPHRENIA

If Biden becomes president of the United States, I (jokingly) hope to see: “If you don’t vote for me, then you ain’t black,” become one of the memorable quotes that will be printed on shirts and mugs for the appreciation of his political being.

All jokes aside, in this time of political unrest, people’s behavior in this situation proves to me that the side of the political spectrum someone is devoted to, determines someone’s full perception of reality. In the past, I was under the impression that left and right always had their disagreements, but were able to find themselves in the middle somewhere each time. Now, however, what the left considers right and wrong is of such great contrast to the values of the right, this one world has two very separate belief systems, to which – in both belief systems – the views of people from the other side of the spectrum seem to be insane. I call it “political schizophrenia”.

To keep things simple, I will very bluntly give a summary each side of the spectrum, based on what I draw from observation. The left perceives itself as the side that is respectful and welcoming towards all people from all countries and all races. In their

ambitions they strive to replace everything that has been around for a long time, with something new: from the Constitution to types of fuel. They perceive the right's conservatism as a severe form of ignorance.

The right perceives itself as the side that collectively strives to defend the country's old principles, which have always been a contribution to its prosperity specifically. In their ambitions they strive to contribute to the country's wealth to become fully independent from globalism. They perceive the left's strong will to take distance from everything conservative as something very destructive to the future potential of a nation.

Do you agree with my descriptions?

“If you support the right/Conservatives/Republicans, you must be a racist, because their stance on immigration is racist, so they are all xenophobes,” is what I consider the greatest misconception about the political doctrine I am devoted to. The (severely) restrictive stance on immigration is, theoretically, not driven by xenophobia. Though, speaking from experience, of course xenophobes exist and an extreme xenophobe is more likely to vote right than left. Still, to assume

that racists/xenophobes is all devotees of a doctrine consists of is incorrect, because restraint on immigration is primarily a way of making sure that you help your own people before you help someone else, and the default set-up of most Western countries is multi-ethnic because of their colonial history, so that includes them and everyone else with the nationality of the country, regardless of race. In my personal philosophy, it is never rational to offer someone from abroad a house and the coverage of living expenses for free, while your own citizens are struggling with housing shortages and unemployment.

To the left, what I just stated will likely still be interpreted as hateful. They'd likely say that Western countries have an abundance of wealth and to withhold someone from that is an exaggeration (while the designated countries abroad are likely not as bad as the media portray them). To that I'd like to say that I think people should slow down on considering Western civilization as superior, in the light of wanting to import everyone into your country because it is considered better than another. (Voting left does not mean that the voter is not a racist. Especially the white people who consider themselves the people who have to solve racism, as if people of

color cannot solve their own problems, are one of the most severe incurable racists this world has ever known.)

Every country has its potential, strengths and weaknesses, and in the light of internationality I think it is better to encourage countries in supporting each other to strengthen their own independence first. Instead of disliking another country or taking over its economy. To mainly focus on strengthening your own country first is enough weight to carry. Isn't it?

Depending on how far to the right someone leans ideologically, he/she may be in favor of restrictions on immigration (thus a filter on who enters the country based on what the potential immigrant aspires to achieve) or no immigration at all. The main objective should be for each country to have living circumstances so good that no one ever wishes to leave. Then there would not even be a need for such great left versus right controversy on immigration policy, because there hardly would be any immigrants.

When it comes to countries that are very large in size, I think a handful of immigrants would not be that much of a problem, given that they have serious aspirations linked to the country they are

immigrating to. But when it comes to a country like the Netherlands, I don't think they should be allowing in any more people from abroad at all. The country is already known for its narrow streets and cities packed with tiny houses. There is not much living space per person, for young people ("starters") it is extremely difficult to qualify for a house, and if every young person wants a house, a car and a baby, which is an exponential process, the end is near. I don't think the country, resources wise, qualifies to welcome immigrants. Really, if I could choose, I would not have been born there because indeed, if it were a country in which only Caucasians lived, then it would have been full enough already.

Then, on top of that, it seems that the majority of immigrants has no intentions of wanting to learn the country's morals and values, let alone adapt them. While that is a crucial aspect of creating a harmonious society. To be clear: I am thus not saying that all immigrants are bad, but I am, however, saying that there are bad apples. (Lil digression: so I am from the Netherlands and I live in the Dutch speaking part of Belgium, but I publish in universally known English because – in regard to my injustice you may have heard about – I feel safer that way. Their psychiatric surveillance system is pretty

fascist and if I'd share that message locally I'd feel I'd be silenced sooner than I would have been helped...)

So what should be focused on, instead of building special neighborhoods for immigrants, I think, is making sure that the problems that incentivize people from abroad to want to leave their country are solved. More about solving the cause of problems in the next chapter.

If you are a supporter of the left, I wonder: do my words make sense to you, or do you consider me a xenophobe as well? Maybe you are now less quick to call someone a xenophobe. Maybe not.

I have a challenge for you. This book is called *Liberal Oppression* for a reason after all. (And this is more of a joke to get a point across than it is something I would actually want you to put yourself through.) I dare you to go on social media, to a page where mostly left-wing supporters go, and post or comment something that shows (just a tiny bit of) appreciation for right-wing politics, without getting scolded. Something like: "Oh boy I am a little bit worried that immigrants will be granted better living circumstances than my own children." Or: "Trump is not that bad." Will you make it out alive?

In this time of political unrest, the left seems to be forcibly pushing through its political agenda. No victory would mean that those 4+ years of extreme anti-right-wing politics propaganda was all for nothing. What I admire in the left is that they can push through most of their political agenda without involving actual politics. They basically control people's trains of thought through the education system and their broadcasting systems. They have their tentacles in almost every influential company you know.

Given their power outside the government, could the left be considered a tyrant? Theoretically speaking, the left's doctrine individually does not allow for one person with superior authority (perhaps because they don't stand for anything), so they could be considered one monster that consists of multiple beings, enforcing an agenda no one can escape. Is liberal oppression legal? The left has power superior to that of the government, and the right has 50% of the government's power or even less.

The media are more powerful than the government is. When the media encourage someone to do something, he/she does it immediately. When the government encourages someone to do something, first it has to be campaigned endlessly,

then a scientist has to state facts about it, and so on. Overall trust is a lot different.

Conservatives (and I...) are censored on social media, people are breaking the law in the name of “anti-racism” and everything related to Caucasian history is “illegalized”. The left can push through their political agenda without any consent. If they win the elections, what will they do next?

And please enlighten me here: so the right basically strives to accomplish being as independent as possible from other countries, to provide for their citizens best. There is a clear pathway to the right-wing utopia. But what does the left strive towards exactly? When the European Parliament overpowers all national governments and all nature is replaced by windmills: then what? Why would my life be better when the transition is complete? Do the people on the left have any idea of the path of destruction they are contributing to? Do they have any long-term vision at all?

When asking a left-wing devotee about their long-term political vision, the response I often get is that they struggle with the idea of the long term. Because according to them, we can never know what the future will be like, so we should make decisions

by the day instead of determining day-to-day policy based on a long term vision.

Here I would say that it is actually possible to know what the future will look like, if you consider all existent policies as stagnate and its consequences exponential, that is what the future will look like if you continue to be passive. By running that simulation mentally (or digitally), you could be on time to make decisions that will change the outcome, instead of having issues blow up in your face as a result of making your decisions based on what the day brings.

So, aside from destroying nature to “create sustainability”, allowing a country to be torn apart in the name of anti-racism, permanently replace their country’s founding principles with anarchy, raising future generations to be social justice police and allowing endless immigration without any restrictions or sending back criminals, what is the left’s dream for the future? What are they working towards? What is Biden’s vision for the future of the United States, whose decisions (or decisions made in his name) will influence the entire world if he wins? Why is he running for president (in the first place)? Where is the Netherlands going to build more vinex

neighborhoods that should never have existed in the first place?

Is it just me, or is the left all about “solving” self-created social problems, while ignoring if not worsening real societal problems? The people exploited and nature destroyed for windmills and biomass fuel are part of the liberal agenda. Instead of ending that, I mean if you are here to do well, (in Western society) so much broadcasting is used for LGBTQ+ propaganda.

Hey, I am willing to accept any sexual orientation someone has, but why is the public debate shifted to this so often? Being part of the LGBTQ+ community is, now that gay marriage and transgenderism are normalized, not that eccentric anymore, isn't it? So why not now make the shift to treating them like anyone else, instead of pointing out how those people are different all the time?

Maybe I'm just bothered because I am extremely indifferent about other people's sexual orientation. I don't consider it a topic for an endless public debate, especially because it is discriminating to treat them as non-standard human beings. There is no need to point out that someone is transgender. As if you'd for every naturally born man point out that the person is a naturally born man. That does not happen, so

neither should it for a naturally born transgender person. (Yes if that is part of God's plan is a separate discussion, but general human rights are general human rights and the sooner this is out of the public debate, the sooner we can start talking about universal things again.) The left seems to overemphasize non-discussions.

When the left has an opportunity to improve the lives of people in a marginalized community, they don't do anything, but they take any opportunity for extremist populism with both hands. To me it seems as if the left its only ambition is to scream "Yes" at any large scale change that is proposed, when it is in contrast to the aspirations of the right. But, of course, tell me why I'm wrong.

THE FANGYIST DREAM

At some point in time, all people in power today will either be retired or dead, and they will be replaced by other people. If the societal disaster that is unfolding right now continues without any interference, we will be living in total anarchy by then.

I have very little sympathy for anarchy. It is a highly defective ideology. This because to find consensus without an authority that gives the final definition of what the consensus is and enforces it, you can only succeed with people who think exactly the same way. And let's face it: no one thinks exactly the same. Even identical twins can have differences of opinion.

Anarchy, however, is very appealing to people from my generation and younger. A long-term contract with only a high school diploma, that later gets you a mortgage to a house with a small yard, is something (unappealing and) unthinkable for most of them. While for generation X and older – their parents – this could sound very normal to the majority.

Terrible decisions, such as the European Union and its currency, have had a very negative impact on today's living circumstances. Most people my age have no faith in politics at all. And I don't blame them: if the world continues to go down this path, there will hardly be any room for real self-development. Your body will then function as nothing other than a highly advanced robot that produces wealth for other people.

But anarchy can never be the solution to that problem. An anarchist only knows that his/her ideology is defective when he/she is suffering the consequences of it, with no way to escape them. Because theoretically, every anarchist is an enemy of the state. When his/her resistance becomes a disturbance of public order, given that it takes place on land that has already been claimed (let's say United States territory), he/she is breaking the law and may rightfully face the consequences thereof. The system that governs human life may have its flaws, but at least it leaves room for peacefully contrasting individualism, in contrast to anarchy's fascism.

Luckily, there is the Fangyist dream. Where anarchy is trying to reinvent the wheel, Fangyism

clears out the few deficiencies that keep your democracy from being absolutely perfect. Aren't you tired of the lack of overall leadership and initiative? With Fangyism, this disturbance will vanish forever.

In Fangyism, the present system of government is the starting point. Fangyists accept that the law is the law, and if there are laws we think are imperfect, we live by them until we have convinced the majority of why the change we wish to push through is an improvement.

Spineless leadership has bothered me a lot during this anti-racism chaos. Regardless of your stance in this debate, if you are sworn in to maintain the compliance of certain rules, you do your job. So when a mayor is supposed to make sure that people practice fascist social distancing and when a mayor is allowed to give law enforcement orders in case of mass-scale disturbances of public order, a mayor should do what the people expect him/her to do. It is his/her job, after all.

Instead of leaders, we have seen spineless populists who encourage the demolition of their own heritage, looking away that one time there was an occasion where they were expected to do what they have the individual privilege of doing. They let down their own loyal citizens in an attempt to be liked by

the mob. There can never be a Summer of Love – in reference to the anarchist CHAZ/CHOP – by people who fiend for destruction. (It is very disturbing to me that it is mostly women who have shown spineless leadership in this particular crisis. The problem is caused by individual personalities and not the gender itself, okay.)

In Fangyism, spineless leadership is illegal. You either do what you are sworn in to do, or you will never get anywhere near power again. No more need to worry about people being responsible for a great scandal resigning and then moving on to the next position of power: people like that will spend the rest of their lives stacking boxes, if not worse.

Only when there is harmony in the rules people live by, will any nation ever be able to thrive out of this globalist chaos. Because the left owns the shadow government, the right must get its power from the truth in the code they follow in stealth. Though unfortunate, Fangyists love the challenge in their mission.

What is Fangyism? It is a political and philosophical doctrine your heart cherishes, but undefinable. Liberal extremists put way too much emphasis on definitions and not enough emphasis on reality and reason.

A Fangyist does not hesitate to upset a social justice warrior that is blurting out incorrect nonsense. Please stop doing things to be liked by people you actually don't even like. Become a Fangyist today.