

## Anti-Racism, Misogyny, Homophobia, Islamophobia, Anti-Semitism

by C.F.

All human societies include relations between humans which interweave with individual and group crystallisations of relative forms of power.

Given that every “anti-” and “mis-*a*” and “-phobia” position logically and conceptually relates to a “pro-” and “mis-*z*” and “-philia” counter-position, then the whole discussion about “anti-racism” etc. boils down to a particular definition of what the content of the concept being referred to should contain and how that content should be ideologically and axiologically weaponised in polemics against the other side so that some form of power increases on one side and decreases on another side.

For example, if I am a (relatively) white person in relation to whom a (relatively) black person cannot legally call a “Cracker” anymore, then on that particular point, the “racism pendulum” swings a tiny bit in favour of me vis-à-vis the black person – the ability or freedom the black person had to legally call me a “Cracker” has been taken from him. Likewise, if my society is 90% relatively white Christian and Secular, and becomes 60% relatively white Christian and Secular, then the relative degree of racism is working against the demographic and cultural group whose percentage of the population, and relative power (at least in terms of quantitative aesthetic-cultural presence), is decreasing.

Any woman gaining rights against “misogyny” is detracting from some of the power men can wield over women, and therefore is increasing relative “misandry”. “Feminism” as amounting, with a whole series of other factors,

over many decades to ethnologically specific low birth rates, means that the racial and or cultural make up of a particular collective (nation, group, etc.) changes if such collective's population increases – this may not have been the original intention of the first wave of “Feminists”, but in all of human history the Heterogony of Ends is always at least potentially and over the long run waiting to come into play.

When homosexuals are allowed to parade in public and marry as a matter of law, then some part of “homophobia” is decreased by the state and “homophilia” is relatively increased. On the other hand, relative “heterophobia” is increased and relative “heterophilia” is decreased.

A woman of the Islamic faith being allowed to wear a Burka in public is enjoying relative “Islamophilia”, as are hundreds or thousands of Muslims gathered together in public prayer engaging in a form of “Christophobia”, given that only a few decades ago the street which the Muslims are now occupying was once Muslim-free; whereas an increase in the number of billionaires who are Jews, already in a great disproportionality to the number of ethnologically-culturally or Israel-conscious Jews amongst the total population, can be seen as a form of “Semitophilia” (or “pro-Semitism, pro-Zionism”), at least amongst certain elites, and the making of further inroads against “anti-Semitism”.

All societies are made up of individuals who *always* have some kind of relationship to *both* a society and (a) group(s) (howsoever defined), *and*, to nature/biology, because humans are, inter alia, always flesh and blood plus (socially derived) symbolism (language, rationality, meaning, understanding, values, etc.).

The field of values is one which human (social) history teaches us is relativised by the action – ideational and physical – of humans, as are group formations

and basic kinds of social formations, at least and especially over very long periods of macro-historical time.

The mono-causal reduction and exegetical simplification of complex human and social phenomena such as the emergence, grosso modo, of capitalism from feudalism, and the leaving out of “inconvenient” facts, constitute pillars of ideological thought, which characterises all non-scientific thought, i.e. thought which is not just descriptive, explanatory, logically consistent and non-normative, but which is ideological, value-laden and has some kind of a particular normative programme or proposed course of action associated with it.

To what extent a society should be “anti-racist”, “feminist”, “homophilic”, “Islamophilic”, “pro-Semitic” (or “pro-Zionist”), etc., is a matter for politics within the overall context of the political as the “interaction of all interactions” which regulates what kind of social coherence, social order and social disciplining, and what levels of anomie, exist in a particular society. All societies have some degree of hierarchy and elements of equality or sameness/similarity, and all societies, even “totalitarian” ones are subject, eventually, to historical Change. The social, which contains the political, includes a friend-foe polarity which has a continuity of almost infinite variety and degrees of relations of forms of power between humans.

The ideological use of terms such as “racism”, “feminism” and “Semitism” leads to all kinds of conceptual confusion – but value-laden normative polemics is not about science as conceptual clarity in distinguishing terms vis-à-vis power relations and/or specific cultural-historical-sociological content, but is about emotions and the gaining of more supporters and the increasing of particular forms of power for particular individuals and/or groups.

Relative racial and/or cultural homogeneity, and relative racial and/or cultural heterogeneity, of themselves, guarantee nothing in terms of what social order

there will be. Just as there have been pre-national Civil and Tribal, as well as National and Imperial(ist), Wars, there have also been relatively stable multi-racial, multi-cultural and relatively mono-racial and multi-racial, mono-cultural societies, etc..

No collective or group (race, sub-race, tribe, nation, ethnos, religion, sect, etc.), howsoever defined, is guaranteed eternal existence and relatively high levels of power. Just as individuals are born and die, so do groups of individuals, at least over the long run, and no matter how much forms of power seem to be crystallising in a given historical conjuncture amongst and in favour of members of (a) particular group(s).

Relative cultural or civilizational and/or a degree of relative racial Continuity can last for thousands of years, e.g. Chinese, Greeks, and Jews, but Change over time means that eventually, whether after a few thousand years or longer, or shorter for other cultural and/or (sub-)racial (ethnic, national, etc.) groups, there will be an End.

Only a few decades ago, Western mass democracies had values and ideologies in terms of Race and Religion, the role and place of Women and Homosexuals and Muslims, quite or very different than the dominant ideology and value positions today.

Relative pluralism in Western mass democracies, particularly as the relative geopolitical and geo-economic balance of power and correlation of forces has been shifting slowly but steadily towards the East, means that when Western mass democracies eventually break down, be that in a few decades or in a century or two or longer, the Battle Lines could well be Racial and or Religious/Ideological or otherwise Tribal, and perhaps relatively very Chaotic and very Violent.

Borders might become relatively open for certain countries, but eventually the question of increasing Anomie will mean that Borders will need to be redrawn, unless a particular country or region decides to, or has to, live in a state of relatively increased Anomie because a more stable Order cannot be enforced.

C.F. maintains and updates the site:

[www.panagiotiskondylis.com](http://www.panagiotiskondylis.com)