

Of being and doing

Written by David Allinson
Monday, 13 December 2010 08:04 -

What need has any man to forgive another who has not admitted his sin?

Well-honed rationalizations for 'hate' denounce any need for the recipients of the act of 'hating' to offer forgiveness. That any man, or any group of men, validates inhumane acts with the employment of culturally acceptable rationalizations is, in itself, irrational. The fault for these mad nuances, and many there be, is not in those who one may expect would issue them (As men who have committed evil are not well fit to accept responsibility for their acts.): The fault is the erroneous acceptance of the acts by those who have been - or will be - recipients of the act. I am, of course, discussing the common discourse attending the rationalizations employed responsibility for crime swelling across South Africa.

Does the vision of a blood-splattered, child's nursery sitting at the end of a blood-splattered hallway which enters into a blood-splattered living room, filled with mutilated bodies, truly require moral dimension to explain its visage? When hate is measured, it manifests an infinite variety of explanations, none of which are plausible given the horrific character of the acts hate manifests.

No human, no principality, no power, can describe what possible incantations befall the human heart capable of unleashing then committing acts of hate - and none should be rendered.

Why, then, is it necessary for otherwise sane men to take measure of the act of hating? We are no more capable of reversing the act of hate than we are the rising and falling tides. We need not ask "Why?" an act of hate has been committed. If we are to inject moral sanity into evil acts we must avoid cultural tendencies to seek explanations, validations, 'rationalizations', for the acts themselves. In short: The character of the acts speaks for itself; it is from this character that all punishment must be meted.

The question isn't, "Why did the crime occur?" The question is, "Who committed the crime?", and when that question is answered, all that needs to be done is to exterminate the guilty with the same indifference one would put to a swarm of locusts.

Of being and doing

Written by David Allinson

Monday, 13 December 2010 08:04 -

When decent men become victims to their own decency they have no one but themselves to blame for the plagues that befall them. There is nothing unusual or unanticipated in the behavior of evil men – They ‘naturally’ employ rationalizations to exploit the decency of their accusers.

The simple act of consideration blends the two – moral and immoral - into a muddled wash of indistinguishable moral confusion. The only cure, if one there be, to the potency of the confusion that has befallen South Africa, and other nations similarly plagued, is to grab the principles of Absolutism.

The potency of Absolutism, and its attending resolve, is the only panacea to the discourse that poisons moral reaction to immoral acts and the retraction of civil society to a state of moral infirmity.

The demise of a culture follows a well-described concourse to cultural genocide. That concourse is scribed by moderated versions of rationalizations that one must accept as plausible for them to be reasonable. As a culture, any culture, slides into the abyss of extinction, former moral values, values earlier defined by adherence to Absolutism, are displaced by rationalizations that would at one time be deemed the comfort of madmen rather than citizens. South African crime is rationalized by accusatory blame; that blame induces guilt that then induces a lack of resolve that then induces moral confusion.

What is the nature of that blame? South African criminals, mostly black, describe that their immoral acts are the end-product of the remnants of Apartheid, white greed and other historical manifestations. Only a mindless fool willingly accepts these rationalizations as plausible but, as we have experienced, the world is now filled with mindless fools.

I offer as proof the simplest of all dialogues: Perceptions of suffering are relative not only to the recipient of that pain but those allegedly inducing the pain. The interjection of the pathology of human suffering by well-meaning sociologists provides a pathway to relativism: If you believe you are a victim, you are a victim – regardless of the illusory substance of your claim.

Anyone familiar with the moral abuses of the French Revolution must see the similarities now present in South Africa that motivate the necessity of the ‘oppressed’ to exterminate their

Of being and doing

Written by David Allinson

Monday, 13 December 2010 08:04 -

'oppressors'. In fact, the French Revolution was won long before the guillotine began to fall; but the revolution wasn't the point of the exercise: The oppressed sought vengeance that would only be sated with blood. The same is true in South Africa: Blacks won their revolution; but their passions will not be sated until the last drop of blood is drawn from the 'oppressor'. Until this reality is realized, the rationalizations will continue to flow with the same velocity as the human blood being drawn.

French 'pebs' were induced to madness by a series of acts that fomented then induced rage. French 'oppressors' were neatly characterized as 'rich', 'powerful', 'capitalist' and 'elitist'; these characterizations thus defined the souls that, in submissive silence, would submit to the masses' rage. Objection to the guillotine's finality were rarely noted among those selected to meet its blade. What imaginable madness infected the minds and souls of the men and women who allowed themselves to 'go quietly to their demise' at the hands of mad mobs? What possible madness consumes white South Africans who, from their collective, allow misery-stricken souls to pass unnoticed from the plains of the living without so much as a moral flinch: Submission? Acceptance? Guilt?

One explanation, it seems, is the power of collective guilt and the acceptance of well-honed rationalizations that, in a sane culture, would induce a violent, defensive response. Another explanation is the divisions of interest that are peculiar to well-established cultures – Unless and until whites recognize their mutual imperilment they will watch in muted silence as the guillotine falls. Someone, somewhere, must declare 'war' before the group is roused to response – even when they are fully aware their mutual demise approaches. No such response is forth coming from any whites – anywhere – even when the evidence is clear: Whites are targeted for extinction.

The term 'white' is noticeably absent from the rationalizations used to describe criminal madness. "Apartheid", "colonialism", "capitalist" are consciously employed to avoid the true context of the assault and potential, though unlikely, accusations of 'racism' that would attend clarification of black-on-white genocide. White rebellion to their extermination is confounded by statistical arguments, historical justifications and the conscious smothering of truth – These behaviors are predictable, common and suicidal. Who, other than whites, are the alleged evil fomenters of "Apartheid", "colonialism" and "capitalism"?

In the course of examination one must ask the sufficiency of the rationalizations employed to eliminate the moral essence attending an immoral act. Does the lingering affect of Apartheid 'excuse' the slaughter of a white family? Is this rationalization morally plausible? Similarly, do 'rich', 'colonialist', 'elitist', 'captor', 'oppressor', 'powerful' sufficiently describe the necessity of

Of being and doing

Written by David Allinson

Monday, 13 December 2010 08:04 -

exterminating whites who, it must be clarified, are the lone recipients of those charges? At what point does irrational become 'irrational'? For sane, moral men, no answer can be rendered, or will be rendered, that in total or in-part answers this moral paradox – The crime does not fit the punishment!

The first principle of Absolutism, "Thou shall not murder" is impermeable to query. What parts of "Thou shall not" and "murder" are vulnerable to man's capacity to rationalize immoral acts? None. Not one. Yet, even the briefest examination of failed states reveals the slow but progressive diminution of moral absolutes to rend the culture powerless to act in its own best interest. Moral absolutes are the first victims to well-honed cultural rationalizations that then become the causeways, the concourse, for all sorts of immoral havoc.

As the culture of failed states erodes into an immoral morass so, too, does the context of the principles of Absolutism that were once the firmament from whence moral sanity evolved.

Absolutes and culture share a symbiotic, reciprocal relationship: As one erodes the other erodes. As "Thou shall not murder" becomes, "Thou shall not murder unless the murder is 'justified'" all manners of rationalizations are submitted to satisfy, "Unless the murder is justified". What grievance, other than self defence, justifies murdering another human being? So it is that in crime-riddled cultures, like South Africa, the submission and acceptance of rationalizations causally eliminates absolutes: "Thou shall not murder" becomes "Define murder?"

The only response to cultural madness, to moral confusion, to the loss of Absolutes is a full refutation of the infection by purging the infected. The historical occasion of failed nation states, especially Rome, offer a partial view of the solutions sane, moral men must seek if they intend to salvage the remnants of their culture and, even, survive the inevitable extinction of their race (Race being culture rather than color.). Sane, moral Romans, with the courage to act, fought to return their nation, their society, to the state of its former grace by a return to principles of Absolutism. Romans eventually returned to the principles of compromise that allowed an infusion of licentious behavior sufficient to destroy the society and the nation – Once fully imbued by moral madness Rome was doomed.

The belief that 'tolerance', 'patience', 'appeasement' or compromise will alter the behavior of the 'infected' to the degree it will dissuade them from pursuing their mad course is folly. Absolutism advances the belief that men are expected to act 'morally', that the alleged infections of culture or history or nurturing (Nature verses nurture) as rationalizations for inhumane acts should be forcefully denounced. (The question of man's moral inheritance is, again, best left to the queries of social scientists who suffer not the liability of their arrogant disregard for reality.)

Of being and doing

Written by David Allinson

Monday, 13 December 2010 08:04 -

Absent from the context of the myriad arguments for or against man's propensity to commit violence are the expectations of those who may be the recipients of that violence. Absolutism does not waver on that point: An act of violence contradicts the welfare of the whole. Violence creates an atmosphere of fear, and that fear contributes to the erosion of faith in the principles of Absolutism. *In fact, it isn't the principles of Absolutism that fail; rather, it is the execution of those principles – their interpretation – that leads to moral confusion. Again: What part of "Thou shall not murder?" lends itself to interpretation?*

The erosion of South African culture (Identical to all cultures born from the virtues of Western Culture) is symptomatic of moral confusion that flows from the erosion of the principles of Absolutism. What 'sane' culture, what 'moral' culture would allow the validation of murderous, inhumane acts, by immoral rationalizations? Do the 'remnants of Apartheid', 'white supremacy', 'elitism', 'capitalism', 'colonialism' sufficiently rationalize the vision of a blood-splattered, child's nursery sitting at the end of a blood-splattered hallway which enters into a blood-splattered living room filled with mutilated bodies? When these 'evils' are purged by the wedge of the guillotine's blade more rationalizations will follow – They always do. *From one outpouring of history's madness to the next, the one constant upon which we may rely with absolute certainty is man's capacity to be evil and, sadly, mankind's willingness to accept rationalizations for the act of doing evil.*