18-Nov-17 – Race-ism vs Racism

Description

[Priss Factor](#)says: • **[Website](#)**

[November 6, 2017 at 8:50 am GMT](#) • 3,200 Words

But now let's try this: If you agree with James Watson, are you a racist? That is, does anyone say of himself that he is a racist? Does your answer strike you as a little odd?

'Racist' blurs race and ism and confused people. The proper spelling should be race-ist. That way, people are more aware of the true meaning. Race means race and Ism means belief. So, race + ism = belief in reality of race, racial differences, and/or necessity of racial consciousness.

So, I say that I am indeed a race-ist. Ism means belief, and race + ism should mean belief in race reality. Ism doesn't mean hatred, chauvinism, or supremacy. It means belief. Now, race-ism can be radicalized into supremacism, as with Nazism or Black Islam stuff or even certain extreme strands of Zionism, as with Meir Kahane. But rational race-ism seeks to understand race and racial differences for what they are.

The big problem is 'racism' has been defined to mean Racial Supremacist Hatred. But when Ism is defined in such a way, it negates the possibility of having a useful term that simply means belief in the reality of race and racial differences. Because mere race + ism has been defined to mean Racial Supremacist Hatred, it's difficult to come up with any objective term about race reality. The term 'racism' was specially designed to suck out all the air so that a neutral rational term is near-impossible. Suppose I define heliocentrism as a hateful supremacist ideology that the sun is great and everything else sucks eggs. Such should be called helio-supremacism or helio-chauvinism. Heliocentrism should just mean the belief that planets revolve around the Sun. It's a belief in objective fact based on science. But if heliocentrism is defined as hateful supremacy of sun-worship, then a neutral term is impossible.
Or take the term 'humanism'. It doesn't mean humans are the bestest thing in the cosmos and has supremacy rule over everything. It means humans have both limits and worth as moral beings and that humans should be mindful of their role, responsibility, and rights as humans on the planet.
But suppose 'humanism' is defined as hateful supremacy of humanity or a conviction that humans are the greatest things in the universe and all must bow down to humans.
Such an attitude should be called human-supremacism, human-chauvinism, or human-megalomania. After all, Ism just means belief. So, there is no reason for 'humanism' to mean anything extreme. As it happens, 'humanism' is defined properly. It doesn't carry supremacist meaning.
But for some reason, 'racism' has been defined to mean 'my race is the best and all others better be our slaves or be exterminated'. Since when does Ism mean something that extreme?

Same goes for nationalism. It should mean belief and defense of one's nation. Nationalism can turn cancerous and become imperialism or jingoism, but nationalism as nationalism isn't extreme. It is belief in the right of one's nation to survive as territory, history, and identity. But the PC media have defined

nationalism(esp among white gentiles) to mean something extreme. So, even the most basic nationalists in Europe who want self-preservation and self-determination are labeled as 'far right'. Mere bread-and-butter nationalism is now associated with imperialist Nazism.

So, if Poles and Hungarians [and Romanians] want to preserve their nations(while respecting other nations), they are compared with 'dark forces' of Nazism and extremism and 'far right'. When something normal as basic nationalism is defined in such extreme way, it sucks out all the air in the room. When mere nationalism is 'nazism', then it's impossible to have a term that simply means belief of national independence and sovereignty. When a neutral or basic term is defined radically, it serves as a terminological black hole. It sucks in and destroys all other possible meanings. It is because a neutral term like race-ism has been made extreme that there is, as yet, no effective term for Basic Belief in the Reality of Race and Racial Differences. This is why the most important thing is to rehabilitate the term race-ism to mean what it should mean: Belief in reality of race and racial differences, and/or realization that such awareness will naturally lead to racial consciousness.

As 'racism' and 'antisemtism' are used in America today, they mean the failure to show proper deference, even reverence, for blacks and Jews. It also means daring to say NO to blacks or Jews or daring to notice negative aspects of the black experience or Jewish influence. So, if in the past, 'racism' and 'antisemitism' meant treating blacks as inferior or Jews as suspect, now it means failing to treat blacks as superior and Jews as the rightful masters. Today, 'racism' means the right of black superioirty, and 'antisemitism' means the right of Jewish supremacism.

Same thing with 'homophobia'. What used to mean an extreme animus against homos just minding their own business has come to mean the refusal to bend over backwards to worship homos. So, if a bakery won't bake 'homo wedding' cake, it is 'homophobic'. If a politician refuses to march in the homo 'pride' parade, he or she is 'homophobic'. Or, if a church says NO to homo colors and banners, it is 'homophobic'. (Granted, even the original use of the term 'homophobia' was bogus since 'homophobia' doesn't exist. Phobia is a clinical terms for extreme pathological panicked fear of something harmless. While it's true that many people feel revulsion about homo, it's not an irrational fear. It is natural healthy reaction to the icky act of homo fecal penetration or tranny penis or poon mutilation.)

Those terms now guard black, Jewish, and homo supremacism. Blacks, Jews, and homos have become difficult and arrogant because they've gotten used to their privileged status as Magic Negro gods, Super Jewish Masters, or wonderful homo angels. Even jokes about homos and trannies will not be tolerated. You better call him Caitlyn.

"it was once the case that being a racist had something to do with a person's feelings or beliefs"

Again, the problem was the willful abuse of terminology. Ism was used to mean something extreme when Ism just means belief. The problem began with how the term originated in the first place.

From the start, it should have been called racial bigotry, racial chauvinism, racial supremacism, or etc. Extreme racial attitudes should not have been called 'racism' as it implies that ism, when applied to race, means just about all the negative connotations under the sun.

Worse, it wasn't just the definition that did the trick. It was the 'idology' and 'iconology' of how the term came to be defined. While dictionaries offer definitions in words, the real power derives from the term's association with certain images and sounds. This is why 'racism' has power only in relation to blacks. Hollywood and PBS and education have given us lots of images of saintly noble blacks martyred by KKK, rednecks, police brutality, and etc. So, images of black victimhood are baked into the minds of millions in association with 'racism'. There used to be some degree of that with American Indians in the 1960s and 1970s, but interest in Indians faded, partly because Indians have little entertainment value

and also because the Indian experience invokes what happened to the Palestinians. (It's interesting that Tarantino's Western deals with southern slavery than with American Indians. It goes to show how much the red man has fallen off the radar, even within the domain of the once most popular movie genre.) When people hear 'racism' in relation to non-blacks, there's just a faint sense that it's wrong but no great passion. After all, Hollywood, TV, and education don't dwell much on Magic Mexican, Suffering Chinese, or some such. And certainly not much on Palestinians. This is why there is no sympathy for Palestinians among most Americans despite the tragedy of Nakba, Occupation, and now apartheid. While most Americans will theoretically agree that 'racism' against Palestinians is wrong, their minds haven't been instilled with iconography or idolatry of Palestinian martyrdom. But suppose Hollywood, TV, and public education produced lots of movies, TV shows, songs, and symbols of Palestinian victimhood. Things would change. But when most people think of Arabs, they think of some Hollywood villain yelling "I will die for Allah" and blowing up people. ('Iconology' matter a tremendous deal. Consider ET. It was all just make-believe. No such creature ever existed or arrived on earth to befriend some boy. But Spielberg's movie made ET so lovable, and so many adults and children were made to weep over ET. So, even though there are so many 100s of millions of people suffering all over the world, more Americans felt more compassion and love for a fictional space creature than for fellow mankind. No less fantastical than ET is the mountain-sized Negro who luvs a wittle white mouse in GREEN MILE. Negroes that big usually play NFL, beat up white boys, and hump white women. But GREEN MILE has white boys and girls weeping at the poor saintly Negro as some divine god figure.) So, what matters is not just the control of terms but controls of icons and idols in relation to those terms. As a child, I saw ROOTS and there's a scene where Chicken George bawls after his chicken-of-freedom done get killed. It is a wrenching scene, and it makes you feel esp sorry for the suffering Negro. That image is baked into my mind. It's like BLAZING SADDLES. Even though the white townsfolk are socially anti-black and hate the idea of 'black sheriff', the Negro's clever use of 'iconology' of the Hepless Negro just tugs at people's heartstrings. Even though I eventually grew out of Magic Negro Myth, it took some time and struggle since I got so much of that Holy Brotha and Sista stuff on PBS, what with MLK orating about the Dream. It took some effort to wean myself from Negropiate and see the Negro what he truly be: Crazy.

What we need to do is rehabilitate the term 'racism' as 'race-ism' and define it properly. Race-ism should just mean a rational and neutral belief in the reality of race and racial differences. Now, race-ism can be rational and objective or it can be based on crazy theories, like that of Nation of Islam that says Dr. Yacub grafted the white race from the black race. Rational Race-ism on blacks would have to conclude that blacks pose a threat to the white race because blacks are more muscular and more aggressive. So, white race-ism in relation to blacks is multi-faceted. When it comes to general intelligence, whites have superiority and advantage. But when it come to muscularity and masculinity, it's the blacks with superiority and advantage. So, if whites were to struggle for racial independenceand liberation from black thuggery, it must be on the basis of white inferiority. Blacks are superior asthugs, and racial integration will destroy white manhood. Race-ism notices both advantages and disadvantages of one race vis-a-vis other races. White race cannot survive without white manhood since white women won't respect men without manhood. White women will go with the negro and create mulatto babies who will turn out like Kaepernick the vile hateful Negro who looks down onwhites as a weak and wussy race. (The fact that his mother is white doesn't make him respect whites.After all, his white mother rejected white men and went with a Negro as the superior stud. This is whycucks are so dumb. They think that if more white women go interracist and have kids with blacks, it willmake blacks nicer to whites. No, it will make blacks feel even more contempt for whites as a race ofcuck white boys and jungle beaver whores.)

Proper rational 'race-ism' is still a work in progress. After all, consider how much racial theories have been revised in recent yrs. Many social scientists assumed that very little evolution happened in last 10,000 yrs. Now, we know much happened. Also, it was believed that Cro-Magnons did NOT mix with Neanderthals. But recent studies have shown that Europeans are anywhere from 1 to 5% Neanderthal. By one-drop rule, one could say Europeans ARE INDEED Neanderthals. (I mean if Elizabeth Warren is an Indian and Shaun King is Negroid.) So, true race-ism is still a work in progress.
Granted, past race-ism claimed to be scientific and led to horrible things, esp with the Nazis. But it's a fallacy to say that because an -ism was abused in the past, it must be wrong in its entirety. That's throwing the baby out with the bathwater. After all, socialism also claimed to be scientific and led to communist excesses that killed millions. But the excesses and crimes of 'scientific socialism' doesn't meant that socialism has NO value. Socialism has great value in right doses. Even American Conservatives are part-socialist. All but the most extreme libertarians believe that there is a collective need for certain attainments and guarantees.

Once we properly define race-ism, we can then prove that everyone is indeed race-ist. Everyone in America notices race and racial differences. Their thoughts and behaviors are affected by racial differences, and this includes everything from residence, education, entertainment, sports, sex, marriage, leadership, respect, contempt, and etc.

It is not uncommon for blacks to say they can sing louder or dance faster. And even white Liberals say as much. It's not uncommon for Jews to say that, hmmm, maybe they are smarter.
It gets confusing because noticing racial differences is sometimes deemed 'anti-racist' and sometimes deemed 'racist'. How can this be? If anti-racism is the belief in the equality of races or the disbelief in race as a valid category, then how can so many people comment on racial differences and be deemed 'anti-racist'?
It all depends on context and tenor. 'Racism' in current usage really means saying something that reflects negatively on blacks. So, if someone says, 'blacks are less intelligent', that is deemed 'racist'.

But if someone says 'blacks are natural athletes and run faster and win medals and bring glory to America', that is 'anti-racist'. But both statements are predicated on racial differences.
Similar thing with Jews. A commentary on Jewish intelligence can be antisemitic or philosemitic. If someone says, "Jews are smarter and use their cunning to maximize Jewish power", that is antisemitic. But if someone says or implies, "Jews are smart and contribute so much to medicine and science and are the holy men of our society who should be blessed and respected", it's philosemitic. So, even though both views are predicated on superior Jewish smarts, one is denounced while the other is praised. Of course, it's like walking a tightrope, but there is an acceptable way to imply that Jews are indeed smarter as long as this reflects well on Jews as a wise, wonderful, and noble race.

But, what about some people who are adamant about race being an invalid concept. The kind of people who ideologically believe that all races are equal, and racial differences are bogus.
But even they are race-ist on another level. Ideologically or intellectually they may be anti-race-ist and egalitarian. But 'iconologically' and 'idologically', their attitudes, choices, and behavior do reflect race-ism, i.e. on the sensual, emotional, or subconscious level, they notice and act on racial differences.
No one who has seen sports over the yrs can really believe that races are equal in athletics. Also, why do the most egalitarian progs prefer to listen to black music than Mexican music or Chinese music? Because blacks got more rhythm. And if someone's child has to have brain surgery, almost all progs will be more relieved if the doctor is Jewish than a Somalian or Peruvian-Indian(even if educated in America). And if a Jewish/white/Asian guy has a grade point average of 4.0 and if a black person also has the same grade point average, even most progs will sense, at least subconsciously, that the Jewish/white/Asian person got a real 4.0 whereas the black person very likely got 4.0 thru grade inflation of a generous professor. I mean how did a nonentity like Michelle Obama make it through Princeton and Harvard? Surely, if a Jewish woman and a black woman both graduated with A's from an elite college, even most progs are gonna sense on some level that the Jewish woman got a real A whereas the black woman got an 'affirmative' A.

And then, look at sexual behavior of Europeans. As we know, most Europeans are proggy and cosmopolitan. In Europe, there is the far left, left, cuck center, and mild right. Anything right of mild right is 'nazi' or 'far right'. So, most Europeans range from centrist to far left. And ideologically, they subscribe to the notion that all races are the same. But 'idologically' and 'iconologically', they behave with the full awareness of racial differences. On the sensual level, black music is appealing because it is funky and sexual in the age of hedonism. Europeans generally don't listen to Arab music even though EU is filled with so many Arabs and Muslims. I mean even Arabs and Afghans in Sweden are likely to listen to rap and hip hop. So, there is a sense that blacks got natural funk and rhythm.
Also, consider sex tourism. Europeans, even on the far left, see Africa as the Penis and Asia as the vagina. This is why white women fly to Africa to have sex with Negroes with big dongs and white European men fly to Thailand and Vietnam for yellow hookers. Now, ideologically, these people may say all the politically correct things, but in terms of preference in entertainment and sex, they feel and act totally race-istically.
And this goes for business too. If Europeans have to build factories, why do they prefer Asian nations to African ones? Again, even if they ideologically believe that blacks are same as yellows, white businesses figure yellowd are more diligent, industrious, obedient, cooperative, and earnest than blacks who tend to be jivey, yibbity-yabbity, and given to funkyass tomfoolery.
So, have the Asians assemble the audio devices and let Afro-funk play on those devices.

So, if we are honest, we can fix the terminology and we can prove that everyone is race-ist, and that is not a bad thing. To be race-ist is neither good nor bad. It is just what it is, like breathing air or drinking

water and peeing. It's just part of reality.

Surely, if a white Prog sees a Mexican thug walking towards him, he will be more confident in fending himself against nasty Guillermo. But if a white Prog sees a Negro thug walking toward him, he will be shi**ing bricks. Why? Because from sports, crime reports, school experience, and general observation, he knows deep inside that races are NOT the same.