

---

## Black Lives Matter

71 messages

---

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Wed, Jun 24, 2020 at 11:53 AM

Hey,

A few days ago, you responded on twitter about BLM...

It's a US phenomenon, but it has blown over to The Netherlands, and things are getting crazy, so I figured I'd look into it some more.

What I found is that more and more things are labeled as "racist" here, even though technically speaking they aren't.

They tend to use very poorly constructed arguments to try and 'prove' racism, specifically institutional racism.

And they are destroying statues all over the country.

The weird thing is, we basically have no institutional racism here, because we never had slaves or a segregated society, unlike the US. We are one of the most progressive and liberal countries in the world, as evidenced by our adoption of women's rights, abortion, gay rights, trans etc.

So what I found is sources that claim that BLM is not what it seems. They speak of "culture Marxism", and extreme left-wing. And I have to say, it makes sense.

There is this thing called "cancel culture" and "deplatforming" which apparently originated on US liberal arts colleges, where 'snowflake' students are overly sensitive to anything that is not 'politically correct' enough to their liking, and which they refer to as 'racist' (there we are).

Their only argument is that they are 'hurt' or 'oppressed', and demand that you acknowledge their pain (which is difficult to do, since their claims are so irrational and far-fetched).

The whole Black Pete thing seems to fit in this narrative perfectly: it's not racist, was never meant as such, but certain groups are casting it as racist, and demand that we 'see their pain', and drop the whole tradition (we already changed from blackface makeup to just soot stripes, which ironically means that only white people can now play the character, because the soot stripes aren't visible on dark skin, and the dark skin would still remind you of the blackface tradition).

In the past week, people tried to cancel a very popular TV show, because one of the pundits had commented on an anti-Black Pete protester who had made a public call to violence during a protest. He literally said "If I see a Black Pete come November, I will personally kick him in the face".

The craziness of the situation, to me anyway, was that nobody questioned his call to violence, nor the preposterous notion of being so agitated by Black Pete in the first place (in our minds, Black Pete is about as racist as a Smurf. As in, if there were people with blue skin, and they'd try to argue that Smurfs are racist, because they have their skin, that's pretty much how we experience it, as there literally is zero reference to oppression, slavery or anything in the way we celebrate Sinterklaas with Black Pete. He's just a character who happens to be black. Just black, no reference to being of African descent).

The focus was entirely on the remark the pundit made, and the alleged 'racist' intention, making the entire show out to be (institutional) racism. Which is preposterous. If anything, the show is all about equality, because the pundits dish it out to everyone in equal matter, and with a good sense of humour.

Effectively BLM is very racist against white people, claiming they have 'white privilege' (which is nonsense, at least in NL), and that they can't say or do anything, because they are incapable of feeling their pain (which ironically enough means that they white people as different and somehow inferior).

I think that notion is nonsense. I believe all people are the same, and there is empathy and feeling in all (with the exception of sociopaths, certain autists etc perhaps, but again, that is not bound to the colour of your skin). And certainly anyone can understand oppression, discrimination, abuse etc.

Aside from that, I don't think equity or equality have anything to do with 'feeling pain' or whatever anyway. That's not an argument. I can think of plenty of situations where someone may 'feel pain', which is not necessarily related to racism or any other form of discrimination. Conversely, even if I may not see or feel pain in certain situations, I can still rationally decide that a situation is unfair and biased, and do something about it (I think the recent change of colour of Black Pete is a good example of that. We don't see Black Pete as racist, because he simply isn't, yet we change colour because we rationally see that there could be a perceived link between Black Pete and people of African descent).

So what's your take on BLM and Antifa in the US?

To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

On 6/24/2020 4:53 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:  
| So what's your take on BLM and Antifa in the US?

My take is that BLM is the newest name given to the civil rights movement, and civil rights are important. I don't always agree to the extent of how much white privilege affects society, but I do recognize it exists and has been a problem for non-white people. I'm also disgusted by the behavior of people who discriminate overtly, and am saddened by people who grew up learning discrimination and don't know any better (and can't be taught).

"antifa" means anti-fascist, and our current national government most definitely is approaching fascism. Every single day there's new stuff brought to light; yesterday it was exposed that some republication states reduced polling stations by 80% in an act of voter suppression. I do not participate in antifa activities, and I don't support any violent activity or retaliation, but I certainly understand them.

There is an established pattern for what has occurred in the last 3 years (and especially the past 6 months), and it is unfortunately a blueprint for civil war. I am legitimately terrified for what will happen the day after our elections in November. If Trump wins, there will be widespread rioting in all major cities. If Trump loses, there will be widespread demonstrations and/or domestic terrorism by armed militia.

I'm not sure how to react to your description of BLM in your country. In particular, your statement "Effectively BLM is very racist against white people, claiming they have 'white privilege' (which is nonsense, at least in NL)...I believe all people are the same". My initial reactions:

- BLM only exists because of racism against blacks in the first place
- White privilege is a global issue, regardless of your country's personal history
- Sometimes people act because they feel they're supporting a global cause by trying to affect local behavior
- "All people are the same" does not change the fact that all people are not \*treated\* the same

I don't try to argue the degrees of racism or privilege, as I'm already in the privileged group, which unavoidably affects my perspective. But it's clear that not all people are treated with the same respect, and that saddens me greatly.

--  
Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org))  
Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>  
A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>  
You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

---

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Wed, Jun 24, 2020 at 10:14 PM

My take is that BLM is the newest name given to the civil rights movement, and civil rights are important. I don't always agree to the extent of how much white privilege affects society, but I do recognize it exists and has been a problem for non-white people. I'm also disgusted by the behavior of people who discriminate overtly, and am saddened by people who grew up learning discrimination and don't know any better (and can't be taught).

Yup, I am well aware of the history in the US. You guys literally had a civil war over whether or not slavery was allowed. Especially the Southern states still seem to be very racist even today. I've seen documentaries about Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, the Black Panther movement, seen movies such as 12 Years A Slave and Mississippi Burning. I know about the KKK, etc. I heard Muhammad Ali talk about his experiences with racism and inequality, even after he was an Olympic champion.

So the US narrative, yes, I get that there were a lot of slaves up to recently, and even when they were 'free', they were still second-class citizens, until a mere few decades ago. Which makes it understandable that even though racism and inequality is gone 'on paper', the effects of this slavery and white supremacy have not yet faded away from society completely.

"antifa" means anti-fascist, and our current national government most definitely is approaching fascism. Every single day there's new stuff brought to light; yesterday it was exposed that some republication states reduced polling stations by 80% in an act of voter suppression. I do not participate in antifa activities, and I don't support any violent activity or retaliation, but I certainly understand them.

I understand the counter-culture. However, they do seem to have a strong element of extreme leftism, Marxism. I'm not entirely sure how BLM and Antifa are allied, but it seems the leaders of BLM are openly Marxist. I appreciate the irony of them claiming that all signs of 'colonial', 'white supremacy' need to be destroyed, while basing themselves on

the work of two white, European males, two Germans, even (Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels). Inevitably, they will have to burn the books that they are basing themselves upon eventually.

Some seem to suggest that BLM and Antifa are funded by Democrats, and are used as a tool to steer the political climate in the right direction before the elections. Not sure if that's just a conspiracy theory. Democrats are left, but certainly not communists.

In fact, this CHOP that they are occupying seems to be more anarchist than anything else, it seems.

There is an established pattern for what has occurred in the last 3 years (and especially the past 6 months), and it is unfortunately a blueprint for civil war. I am legitimately terrified for what will happen the day after our elections in November. If Trump wins, there will be widespread rioting in all major cities. If Trump loses, there will be widespread demonstrations and/or domestic terrorism by armed militia.

Yea, I've come to view Trump in a different light recently. Our mainstream media tend to be very left-wing oriented, and denounce everything he says and does.

I have to admit, the guy is a total clown, and he screwed up pretty badly with the corona crisis. But marking up Antifa as a terrorist organization may actually be a good call. I feel he had them figured out before I did.

I'm not sure how to react to your description of BLM in your country. In particular, your statement "Effectively BLM is very racist against white people, claiming they have 'white privilege' (which is nonsense, at least in NL)...I believe all people are the same". My initial reactions:

- BLM only exists because of racism against blacks in the first place

Yea, that's the thing. The US has a problem with gun control and crime, so you have an extremely high level of police encounters that result in serious injuries or death, compared to any other Western country.

So as far as I know from the news, documentaries etc, there indeed are a high number of people killed by the police every year, and there is a relatively large number of black people among them.

On the other hand, black people also tend to be poorer, living in less developed areas, and turn to crime more quickly because of lack of proper education and opportunities. So it's not entirely without reason that the police may have more brutality against black people. I'm not sure if racism is the primary reason there. It may just be the poverty, which is most probably a result of the slavery and second-class citizenship, that many black families are unable to escape even after many generations. You see the same with really poor white people though, the so-called trailer trash. Although I have no idea how they relate to each other in size, poverty, crime etc.

But we don't have any of that.

We only had slavery 'on paper' here. That is, people looked through the records of slave transport, and found that only a handful of slaves (literally like 10-20 a year) would actually remain in Holland, probably to serve as domestic servants and such. Everyone was shipped to the US and sold.

Which means that until about 1950 or so, there basically were no black people in The Netherlands. By that time, slavery was long abolished, and we had quite a socialist and caring constitution, with not even remotely any signs of segregation. They started to come here, mostly from our former colonies, mainly Suriname, to find better education and fortune, as free people.

Even today, I believe only about 15% of our population is coloured, a smaller amount still is black. The largest ethnic group is Indonesian, from our former Asian colonies.

So basically nobody ever lived as a slave here, or even a second-class citizen. The only thing they may have encountered is xenophobia.

- White privilege is a global issue, regardless of your country's personal history

I would disagree with that. White privilege may exist in some countries, but I'm pretty sure that it doesn't in at least some parts of Africa (in South Africa they actually kill white people, they've taken over their farms/ranches), and I wouldn't expect much of it in the Middle East or Asia either.

I also bet I'd be considerably more privileged if I moved to the US than over here.

- Sometimes people act because they feel they're supporting a global cause by trying to affect local behavior

That is true, I get the feeling that a lot of these 'activists' don't have much of a clue, and just support a cause because they think it's good. Even celebrities have made some crazy claims over here.

- "All people are the same" does not change the fact that all people are not \*treated\* the same

Sure, but in our case the problem is mostly the reverse. We are an extremely socialist country, and there are so many ways in which the poor can get help, either in terms of money, or by being allowed a position because of a 'quota' or whatever, that some people actually speak of 'black privilege' here. The same goes for women. Many of us know of situations where a woman or a black person is obviously there because of what they are, rather than what they are capable of.

In fact, even a lot of black people are now speaking out against BLM and such, because they openly claim never to have suffered much, if at all, from discrimination, and got all the chances they needed in life, to get a good education and find a good job. They say that they know why some complain, and their motives are not pure.

They dislike that BLM paints them as 'victims', because they don't feel like victims and they don't want 'help'. They made it on their own, and if others just grabbed the chances that they are given, they could do the same. There's nothing keeping them from it. They see 'institutional racism' as a hoax.

I don't try to argue the degrees of racism or privilege, as I'm already in the privileged group, which unavoidably affects my perspective. But it's clear that not all people are treated with the same respect, and that saddens me greatly.

My perception has always been that there's no advantage to being a white male over here. Being a woman, coloured, foreign, gay, trans or whatever would give you a better chance to meet some 'quota'. We just have to work our way up the hard way: get an education, get a job, and build up your life.

When this BLM thing came to NL, I initially thought "They make it sound like we're the same as the US, no way that can be true". Initially there was a wave of black people in the mainstream media, supporting this narrative. But then I looked around on Twitter, and I found plenty of black people who completely disagreed with it.

It's a bit strange of course, one of these people is Sylvana Simons... She's a former TV presenter and is now in the city council of Amsterdam. I'd say that's pretty privileged. But she's the one complaining how hard it is to be black. Erm, how exactly? You have celebrity status, and you have a cushy job that probably pays a heck of a lot more than what I got, with a higher education than what you ever finished. So what exactly did the evil white man keep you from?

And that's the point: they never get specific about anything. It's all vague claims or completely misinterpreted facts. It feels like gaslighting.

So I am somewhat expecting black people to turn against BLM here and burst their bubble, because their toxic narrative is actually racist itself. It is a direct attack on white people and their culture. And it destroys the system of equality and freedom that we've built up. I think, or at least hope, that the majority of black people see it that way, so they will be on our side, trying to keep our country as it is, rather than an upcoming revolution.

We are being silenced, we are being cancelled (as evidenced by the fact that shows like Little Britain and Fawlty Towers were removed from online services, about as crazy as the Black Pete thing).

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Fri, Jun 26, 2020 at 6:59 PM

This gives a very interesting perspective on the Black Pete character by the way:

<https://paganeurope.com/>

Just watching the trailers should tell you enough.

So next time you hear anyone talking about Black Pete being racist, or even specifically a Dutch tradition, please refer them to this documentary.

It seems that in America (not just the US, but the whole, including the pacific islands etc), people are incapable of understanding that some parts of the world have a very long and rich history, just because their history doesn't go back further than a few hundred years (or at least, the history of the previous owners was pretty much wiped out). These traditions seem to go back further than any coloured man ever set foot on European soil.

I mean, we already knew it wasn't racist, obviously, since there was no connotation of black people, racism, slavery or anything. Black Pete is a sort of satanic figure, who punishes children when they're bad (they go in his bag, back to Spain).

But this documentary proves it beyond a shadow of a doubt. The tradition is even found as far as Turkey and Iran. They have nothing to do at all with American colonies.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Fri, Jun 26, 2020 at 9:13 PM

The problem you'll find is that trying to debate this with some people is like trying to debate someone on matters of faith.

On 6/26/2020 11:59 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

This gives a very interesting perspective on the Black Pete character by the way:

<https://paganeurope.com/>

Just watching the trailers should tell you enough.

So next time you hear anyone talking about Black Pete being racist, or even specifically a Dutch tradition, please refer them to this documentary.

It seems that in America (not just the US, but the whole, including the pacific islands etc), people are incapable of understanding that some parts of the world have a very long and rich history, just because their history doesn't go back further than a few hundred years (or at least, the history of the previous owners was pretty much wiped out). These traditions seem to go back further than any coloured man ever set foot on European soil.

I mean, we already knew it wasn't racist, obviously, since there was no connotation of black people, racism, slavery or anything. Black Pete is a sort of satanic figure, who punishes children when they're bad (they go in his bag, back to Spain).

But this documentary proves it beyond a shadow of a doubt. The tradition is even found as far as Turkey and Iran. They have nothing to do at all with American colonies.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Fri, Jun 26, 2020 at 11:49 PM

I'm not asking for debate. Just to put the information out there.

Things are so crazy that foreigners are screaming "racist" at people here. And on twitter I even read that "The Netherlands is in the top 5 most racist countries because they have Black Pete".

There appears to be a deliberate propaganda machine active on social media to completely destroy our society, and possibly that of many other Western nations.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sat, Jun 27, 2020 at 12:14 AM

I don't think it's a \*deliberate\* propaganda machine. I think it's an accidental one, created accidentally by machine learning. I first started noticing this kind of thing about 6 years ago, when social media platforms started recommending based on engagement trained by ML. ML isn't always well-understood by those who implement it, and don't notice (or don't care) when it falls into local minima:

- Goal parameters: Increase engagement and time spent on platform to maximize advertising exposure
- Solution after training: People outraged and yelling at each other produces maximum engagement

On 6/26/2020 4:49 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

I'm not asking for debate. Just to put the information out there.

Things are so crazy that foreigners are screaming "racist" at people here. And on twitter I even read that "The Netherlands is in the top 5 most racist countries because they have Black Pete".

There appears to be a deliberate propaganda machine active on social media to completely destroy our society, and possibly that of many other Western nations.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)

Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>

A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>

You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Jun 27, 2020 at 12:35 AM

It's a bit worse than that though. There's this Dutch 'scientist', Gloria Wekker, who wrote various books on racism, colonialism etc a few years ago. She also talks about Black Pete.

It was all debunked years ago already, it's pseudoscientific nonsense: <https://saltmines.nl/2017/12/19/gloria-wekker-ontmaskerd-haar-werk-blijkt-aantoonbare-nepwetenschap/>

But this is exactly what is being used now by BLM and other 'antiracism' groups, and the mainstream media are eating it up, as are people on social media.

Nobody seems to care to check where this 'information' came from, and if it is even legit. They just blindly accept that there's 'white privilege' and that we have some kind of subconscious racism, because of our colonial past. That woman wrote entire books trying to 'support' those concepts.

And now people point to her work as an allegedly scientific basis for this nonsense.

[Quoted text hidden]



---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Tue, Jun 30, 2020 at 3:00 PM

I think it works... Some foreigner, presumably African-American, posted his outrage on Zwarte Piet. So I just linked the documentary, and added that pagan traditions can be really weird and impossible to comprehend. Some people even put a tree in their home in December. And they just kept silent. If they didn't, I wouldn't have responded, because it's useless anyway. But I think they may actually have gotten the message that you really can't judge other people's traditions based on just a photograph, and no context whatsoever.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Jul 4, 2020 at 11:22 PM

Well, Trump just outright said it in his speech today. There's this cancel-culture that's trying to shut up any differing opinions from extreme-left (Marxist) fascists, and is trying to wipe out the history, and the freedom of the nation. Pretty much the same thing seemed to be happening here, but over the past week, there's been more of a counter-attack online and in many newspapers, including ones that are considered 'left'. It's just our public broadcasting organization that still hasn't quite shown the other side of the debate. They also didn't show Trump's speech, and tried to frame it to make Trump look bad (they always do that anyway).

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sun, Jul 5, 2020 at 10:05 PM

I'm sorry, but you and I can't have a conversation about this specific topic; we don't have the same views on the subject.

On 7/4/2020 4:22 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Well, Trump just outright said it in his speech today. There's this cancel-culture that's trying to shut up any differing opinions from extreme-left (Marxist) fascists, and is trying to wipe out the history, and the freedom of the nation. Pretty much the same thing seemed to be happening here, but over the past week, there's been more of a counter-attack online and in many newspapers, including ones that are considered 'left'. It's just our public broadcasting organization that still hasn't quite shown the other side of the debate. They also didn't show Trump's speech, and tried to frame it to make Trump look bad (they always do that anyway).

On Tue, Jun 30, 2020 at 3:00 PM Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org <mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>> wrote:

I think it works... Some foreigner, presumably African-American, posted his outrage on Zwarte Piet. So I just linked the documentary, and added that pagan traditions can be really weird and impossible to comprehend. Some people even put a tree in their home in December. And they just kept silent. If they didn't, I wouldn't have responded, because it's useless anyway. But I think they may actually have gotten the message that you really can't judge other people's traditions based on just a photograph, and no context whatsoever.

On Sat, Jun 27, 2020 at 12:35 AM Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org <mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>> wrote:

It's a bit worse than that though. There's this Dutch 'scientist', Gloria Wekker, who wrote various books on racism, colonism etc a few years ago. She also talks about Black Pete. It was all debunked years ago already, it's pseudoscientific nonsense: <https://saltmines.nl/2017/12/19/gloria-wekker-ontmaskerd-haar-werk-blijkt-aantoonbare-nepwetenschap/> But this is exactly what is being used now by BLM and other 'antiracism' groups, and the mainstream media are eating it up, as are people on social media. Nobody seems to care to check where this 'information' came from, and if it is even legit. They just blindly accept that there's 'white privilege' and that we have some kind of subconscious racism, because of our colonial past. That woman wrote entire books trying to 'support' those concepts. And now people point to her work as an allegedly scientific basis for this nonsense.

On Sat, Jun 27, 2020 at 12:14 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org> <mailto:trixter@oldskool.org  
<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)

> Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>

> A child borne of the home computer wars:

<http://trixter.oldskool.org/>

> You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

>

-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>)

Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>

A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>

You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sun, Jul 5, 2020 at 10:21 PM

Well, that's interesting. Normally, having differing opinions is EXACTLY the reason why one should have a conversation. After all, there should only exist one objective truth. So if two people have different views, then at least one of them can not be the objective truth. People can learn from the viewpoints of one another. Both Trump and Obama have spoken out about the cancel-culture by the way, so that pretty much rules out that it's propaganda from one political side. It also leads to self-censorship. People being afraid to speak out their thoughts, because of possible repercussions.

We also saw a bit of it today with Formula 1. Lewis Hamilton that everyone took the knee before the race. 6 drivers decided against it. They did wear an "End racism" shirt though. Still they were attacked on social media, and by certain celebrities.

Anyway, no hard feelings.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 5:46 AM

I don't feel it's worth having a conversation if nothing productive can come about because of it. The divide is too great between our views. But if you want my view, here it is: I understand that there are degrees of correctness, but I feel it's a question of whether or not people are selfish. If getting rid of a stereotype, or acknowledging that a race has been discriminated against, makes an entire race feel better, then I don't really feel there's anything to discuss: Doing it is selfless; arguing anything else is selfish, as it gains nothing to hold onto it. Whenever I see people (in general) trying to argue against actions that would help others, it makes me very hard to see their viewpoint.

Also, Trump is an utter monster, so any time anyone brings up something he said as "well, he's right!" means we can't have a conversation. It doesn't matter if he's right in one tiny isolated incident -- he is a pathological narcissist whose entire existence is motivated by how people perceive him. He acts based on how it will affect his ratings instead of how much good will come of it. A broken clock is right twice a day, but that doesn't mean you can count on it for anything resembling correct time. Trying to use him as any sort of discussion point automatically brings into question what you're trying to argue.

(Trump doesn't need any help from the media looking bad, btw. He's looked bad for 35 years. He's a thug, and a grifter, as anyone who lived in New York that had to deal with him can tell you. I'm not sure how you think the media is making him look bad when all they do is show video clips of him speaking, and not taken out of context. The next time you want to discuss a human rights issue, it would be best to do so without ever mentioning Trump's name.)

If this Zwarte Piet thing is such an issue, why must he continue to be represented by people in blackface? What's wrong with only portraying him using Arab actors? That would eliminate any complaint from black people while still preserving the tradition. And if there's some argument to keeping things the way they are, my response is that Zwarte Piet is a fictional person that never existed, and that it is pointless to waste any brain power whatsoever on discussing something so meaningless.

Demoscene is also meaningless, but at least it's constructive. We build things that bring happiness to a group of people. If I had to spend any time on anything meaningless, I'd want it to be constructive, or making people happy, or both. Debating the degrees of racism and cancel culture is so at the opposite end of that spectrum that I'm simply not going to waste my time. I have nothing to gain and everything to lose (I'm already quite upset just trying to

communicate this, which I'm sure is shaving a few hours off of the end of my life). It doesn't matter what my views are -- it's pointless to discuss. Do you think anyone can change the tide of cancel culture? Can anyone suddenly change the minds or actions of tens of millions of people? It's a stampede. Cancel culture isn't going away until social media goes away, so I choose to adapt to it, rather than try to fight it. Is some of it wrong, factually baseless, and unwarranted? Yes. Now get over it.

On 7/5/2020 3:21 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Well, that's interesting. Normally, having differing opinions is EXACTLY the reason why one should have a conversation. After all, there should only exist one objective truth. So if two people have different views, then at least one of them can not be the objective truth. People can learn from the viewpoints of one another. Both Trump and Obama have spoken out about the cancel-culture by the way, so that pretty much rules out that it's propaganda from one political side. It also leads to self-censorship. People being afraid to speak out their thoughts, because of possible repercussions.

We also saw a bit of it today with Formula 1. Lewis Hamilton that everyone took the knee before the race. 6 drivers decided against it. They did wear an "End racism" shirt though. Still they were attacked on social media, and by certain celebrities.

Anyway, no hard feelings.

On Sun, Jul 5, 2020 at 10:05 PM Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>> wrote:

I'm sorry, but you and I can't have a conversation about this specific topic; we don't have the same views on the subject.

On 7/4/2020 4:22 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

> Well, Trump just outright said it in his speech today. There's this  
> cancel-culture that's trying to shut up any differing opinions from  
> extreme-left (Marxist) fascists, and is trying to wipe out the history,  
and  
> the freedom of the nation.  
> Pretty much the same thing seemed to be happening here, but over the past  
> week, there's been more of a counter-attack online and in many newspapers,  
> including ones that are considered 'left'. It's just our public  
broadcasting  
> organization that still hasn't quite shown the other side of the  
debate. They  
> also didn't show Trump's speech, and tried to frame it to make Trump  
look bad  
> (they always do that anyway).

>  
> On Tue, Jun 30, 2020 at 3:00 PM Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)  
<<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>

> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>> wrote:

>  
> I think it works... Some foreigner, presumably African-American, posted  
> his outrage on Zwarte Piet.

> So I just linked the documentary, and added that pagan traditions  
can be

> really weird and impossible to comprehend. Some people even put a  
tree in

> their home in December.

> And they just kept silent. If they didn't, I wouldn't have responded,

> because it's useless anyway. But I think they may actually have  
gotten the

> message that you really can't judge other people's traditions based on  
> just a photograph, and no context whatsoever.

>  
> On Sat, Jun 27, 2020 at 12:35 AM Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)  
<<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>

> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>> wrote:

>  
> It's a bit worse than that though. There's this Dutch 'scientist',  
> Gloria Wekker, who wrote various books on racism, colonialism etc

a few

> years ago. She also talks about Black Pete.

> It was all debunked years ago already, it's pseudoscientific  
nonsense:

>

<https://saltmines.nl/2017/12/19/gloria-wekker-ontmaskerd-haar-werk-blijkt-aantoonbare-nepwetenschap/>



> But this is exactly what is being used now by BLM and other  
> 'antiracism' groups, and the mainstream media are eating it up,  
as are  
> people on social media.  
> Nobody seems to care to check where this 'information' came  
from, and  
> if it is even legit. They just blindly accept that there's 'white  
> privilege' and that we have some kind of subconscious racism,  
because  
> of our colonial past. That woman wrote entire books trying to  
> 'support' those concepts.  
> And now people point to her work as an allegedly scientific  
basis for  
> this nonsense.  
>  
> On Sat, Jun 27, 2020 at 12:14 AM Jim Leonard  
<[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

[Quoted text hidden]

> <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>> <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>>>)  
> > Check out some trippy MindCandy:  
<http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>  
> > A child borne of the home computer wars:  
> <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>  
> > You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!  
> >  
>  
> --  
> Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)  
<<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>> <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>  
<<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>>)  
> Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>  
> A child borne of the home computer wars:  
<http://trixter.oldskool.org/>  
> You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!  
>  
  
-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)  
Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>  
A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>  
You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 10:31 AM

On Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 5:47 AM Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)> wrote:  
| The divide is too great between our views.

I don't think it is.

But if you want my view, here it is: I understand that there are degrees of correctness, but I feel it's a question of whether or not people are selfish. If getting rid of a stereotype, or acknowledging that a race has been discriminated against, makes an entire race feel better, then I don't really feel there's anything to discuss: Doing it is selfless; arguing anything else is selfish, as it gains nothing to hold onto it. Whenever I see people (in general) trying to argue against actions that would help others, it makes me very hard to see their viewpoint.

I think we agree there. It's more a question of what actions people ask of you, the way in which they ask/demand them, and whether they actually help anyone.

| Also, Trump is an utter monster

We certainly agree there as well. Trump is by far the worst president I've ever experienced. The guy is an idiot in general. Just look how cluelessly he handled the Corona-crisis. And how he then proceeded to lie about how well he handled it, and how he's been on top of the situation all the way.

And although I agree with what he said in that speech, I don't think the way he said it was exactly the most strategic, tactful way to do it.

Obama was WAY better in delivering speeches, and at least my impression was that he could unite all Americans.

If this Zwarte Piet thing is such an issue, why must he continue to be represented by people in blackface? What's wrong with only portraying him using Arab actors? That would eliminate any complaint from black people while still preserving the tradition. And if there's some argument to keeping things the way they are, my response is that Zwarte Piet is a fictional person that never existed, and that it is pointless to waste any brain power whatsoever on discussing something so meaningless.

It's mostly a practical thing.

People of colour don't live everywhere, and there aren't that many of them.

Every town will organize Sinterklaas-events, where Sinterklaas will appear with a number of Zwarte Pieten (say 15-20 at a time, depending).

Sinterklaas will also visit every school and many offices.

And many parents will have Sinterklaas and one or two Zwarte Pieten visit them on the evening itself.

This is done by local people who dress up as Sinterklaas and Zwarte Piet, usually people from the school or office, or the next-door neighbour. The beard makes Sinterklaas difficult to recognize, and the blackface makes the Zwarte Pieten difficult to recognize. Which is important for children. The magic is lost when they can recognize the people.

Did you know that even in our former colonies, they celebrate exactly the same way? And even though most people there are black, they still use blackface to make their faces darker and unrecognizable: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ebqjBorA1T4>

[youtube.com/watch?v=ebqjBorA1T4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ebqjBorA1T4)

So that's the thing. These black people don't see any racism there. The kids love it. It's fun to dress up as Zwarte Piet, sing and dance with the kids, play around, hand out candy and presents etc.

Firstly, I don't think the term 'blackface' is even appropriate. I know the term 'blackface' from vaudeville in the US in the early 20th century (when black people were generally not even allowed to perform at all, at least not for white audiences).

This doesn't have ANYTHING to do with that. It's just using black make-up to make yourself unrecognizable and play a fantasy character. You're not actually trying to play 'a black person', let alone ridicule one.

Secondly, I think the people who claim that only black people can use black make-up in this way are the ones who are being racist. because they are the ones who are saying that you can't do something because of the colour of your skin. I mean, you could argue "use another colour", but that doesn't change the fact that black people claim a monopoly on the colour black for the make-up. Why could you use any other colour but black?

So I think the right solution would be to make the black people who don't see racism in the tradition explain to the people who object to it.

These racists have basically destroyed a perfectly harmless and fun children's tradition for no good reason at all (their claim that it is about slavery is complete nonsense, there is something really wrong about destroying a harmless tradition based on outright lies).

So I guess my take on it is that I don't think people should cave just every time someone claims they're 'offended' by anything. Firstly, you can't ever know if they are sincerely offended. Secondly, even if they are offended, that may just be based on a misconception of the things they are offended by.

This is especially apparent to me because of the fact that I'm 42 now, and I've NEVER heard anything like this when I was young. Not from the black kids in my class, their parents, my black teachers or anyone. They all enjoyed it. And now suddenly, since a few years, there's this nonsense about it. Where did that come from? And then we see crap like Robin DiAngelo's "White Fragility" book. Effectively she professes the whole white supremacy thing from the KKK, but turns it around: instead of convincing whites that they are superior, she tries to convince blacks that whites are superior, to seed hatred.

I don't think whites are superior, and I refuse to acknowledge this when a black person tells me so. Because I'm not racist.

---

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Wed, Jul 15, 2020 at 10:59 PM

I do have to say, your response is somewhat like what I seem to notice more and more from people. They don't even bother to discuss something. They see everything in wrong and right, and cancel culture is just to drown out everything that you think is 'wrong', regardless of whether your assessment is even correct.

In a way you drowned out any discussion of Trump.

Now, I am not too familiar with US politics, but what I gathered from it over the years is that it's very much a two-horse race. You're either Democrat or Republican, and both camps basically think the other camp is wrong in everything. I'm not used to that. We have many political parties, and most of the time no single party gets a majority government by

itself, so they have to form coalitions with other parties to get that majority vote. Which also means that they have to compromise on their initial political viewpoints, and adopt some viewpoints of the other parties.

The prime minister as a result, may be from a specific party, but is representing the government as a whole, and generally is supported by the public.

I suppose in theory the US president should have a similar role, he's the president of all US citizens. But in practice it doesn't quite work out that way. Especially not with a controversial president like Trump.

Now, my personal political stance is quite far from Trump in general, and I do think he made poor decisions in many things.

I believe in a degree of socialism. Not full-blown communism (we've seen how that fails in Europe), but 'taking the edge off' capitalism, by having relatively high taxes on large incomes, and using that to support the unemployed, healthcare etc. I suppose technically you can call that left-wing.

However, in social terms, I value freedom and especially freedom of speech. I have opinions and I like to voice them and discuss (like I do on my blog for example).

And I also believe in having a good police force to keep crime in check, and generally have a safe environment for everyone.

I think those values are the cornerstone of Western civilization. They got us to where we are today. And these things seem under threat in many Western countries. So I don't think it's meaningless.

And while I never thought much of Trump, in recent weeks he has spoken out on these issues, and is willing to defend these values. Which I think is a good thing.

Because I think the woke culture, BLM and Antifa are threats to Western civilization.

A Dutch writer said: "If you don't value freedom of speech, you probably never needed it". I think that's an excellent point. Some people are not outspoken, don't have any specific opinions on things, but just go along with the 'safe' world view. I'm not one of those. So I do feel that threat (and technically I've been 'cancelled' from various forums over the years, including VCF and Vogons, because some people can't just accept different opinions. They kept piling on as a mob, thread after thread, often even taking shots at me in threads I was not even participating in. Just silencing you because you have a different opinion. If only more people valued free speech, I would still be active on those forums, and in those communities. If someone had defended my right to my opinion. Not because they agree with me, but because I have the right).

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 4:59 AM

On 7/15/2020 3:59 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

| In a way you drowned out any discussion of Trump.

Because it's not worth discussing. Anyone who supports Trump is either selfish or ignorant. (I am not suggesting you support Trump.)

| Now, I am not too familiar with US politics, but what I gathered from it over the years is that it's very much a two-horse race.

That's correct. There are many republican candidates, and many democratic candidates, and we vote for which one we want. So there are degrees in the candidates themselves, but there are only two practical parties (there are two others but they get 10% or less of the vote, so voting for them is effectively throwing your vote away).

| both camps basically think the other camp is wrong in

That's not always the case. There are many bills passed in our government that are bipartisan.

I'm not sure you understand just how generationally unique it is to have a president like Trump. He doesn't even try to hide corruption any more; he commuted the jail sentence of someone who refused to testify against him in court. It's beyond brazen. The last world leaders I can remember being anywhere near Trump were Putin and Berlusconi, and they are/were horrible.

| I suppose in theory the US president should have a similar role, he's the president of all US citizens.

What usually happens is that any president goes mostly moderate/center once they're in office. Obama was democratic/liberal but once in office he did some conservative things too.

| I believe in a degree of socialism.

Don't visit the USA then :-). The freedom to do whatever someone wants to do without government involvement is an American ideal held very strongly by some of the population. I am not one of these people; I think the government should help the people, especially since the people elected them.

And while I never thought much of Trump, in recent weeks he has spoken out on these issues, and is willing to defend these values. Which I think is a good thing.

But he's not doing it for the reasons you think he is. What he believes changes from day to day. His narcissism is no longer a joke; it's a real, pathological mental illness at this point.

Because I think the woke culture, BLM and Antifa are threats to Western civilization.

And that's where we differ, and why we can't have a conversation.

Some of these movements aren't about shutting down free speech; they're about giving a voice to oppressed people whose voice was ignored or suppressed.

"There are two sides to every issue" is a dangerous philosophy. If you want to argue that all issues deserve debate, please tell me what the "other side" of racial prejudice is, or what the "other side" of transphobia is, etc. Some people really do deserve to be shut down. Does \*everyone\* deserve it? No, but if someone has been shut down, there is usually an overwhelmingly understandable and justifiable reason why it happened.

A Dutch writer said: "If you don't value freedom of speech, you probably never needed it". I think that's an excellent point. Some people are not outspoken, don't have any specific opinions on things, but just go along with the 'safe' world view. I'm not one of those. So I do feel that threat (and technically I've been 'cancelled' from various forums over the years, including VCF and Vogons, because some people can't just accept different opinions. They kept piling on as a mob, thread after thread, often even taking shots at me in threads I was not even participating in. Just silencing you because you have a different opinion. If only more people valued free speech, I would still be active on those forums, and in those communities. If someone had defended my right to my opinion. Not because they agree with me, but because I have the right).

I have a reason for this, but am withholding it to prevent conflict between us. But if you want me to elaborate, I can.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 11:17 AM

On Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 4:59 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org> wrote:

Because it's not worth discussing. Anyone who supports Trump is either selfish or ignorant. (I am not suggesting you support Trump.)

But that's the thing. You only get two choices for a president. I think Trump's election is partly because people thought Trump may be bad, but the other side is worse.

Not saying they'd be right. But I do think this time, Joe Biden is a very poor candidate. He seems too old, often seems absent-minded, gets his words mixed up sometimes (like he said something like there were 120 million deaths from COVID-19, where I believe he meant 120 thousand).

Aside from that, I'm not entirely sure what the Democrats want. BLM/Antifa hold Marxist/anarchist beliefs. Defunding the police is a bad idea, yet some Democrat-run cities are actually giving in to these demands and are defunding police. Like New York, where crime becomes a bigger problem as the police force gets smaller.

If electing a Democrat president means there will be more of that kind of nonsense, then it'd be very difficult for me to vote for that.

I'm not sure you understand just how generationally unique it is to have a president like Trump. He doesn't even try to hide corruption any more; he commuted the jail sentence of someone who refused to testify against him in court. It's beyond brazen. The last world leaders I can remember being anywhere near Trump were Putin and Berlusconi, and they are/were horrible.

It's difficult for me to really understand what is going on, as I only have limited info on the situation.

I don't trust Trump, especially because he also still hasn't done his tax audit.

However, what I understood from the pardon he gave, is that the person was charged in the Russian probe case. The whole case fell through, because of lack of evidence (where I can't make out whether that's because the whole Russian thing was a hoax and there really was nothing there, or they managed to hide all the evidence well enough). But regardless, the situation is that he was charged in a case that was dismissed, and the only thing they have against him is his conduct in a case where he shouldn't have been charged in the first place. By that logic the pardon isn't that crazy.

I don't know the details of what he was supposed to testify, and what he allegedly hid. If it was about the Russian thing and there was nothing to hide, then it's suspect. However, if they used the case to pressure him to testify otherwise unrelated, but potentially damaging information on Trump and his administration, then that would be unethical/immoral from the Democrat side.

So I really don't know what happened exactly, but I think both sides may have been out of line.

Don't visit the USA then :-) The freedom to do whatever someone wants to do without government involvement is an American ideal held very strongly by some of the population. I am not one of these people; I think the government should help the people, especially since the people elected them.

Yea, that's why I think Obamacare was a good initiative, and Trump turned that back down. But it seems that many black Trump voters vote for this 'free enterprise' ideal of the Republicans. They believe that the US is the land of infinite possibilities, and you can get far by putting in the effort and taking any chance that presents itself. They don't believe in the Democrat view of blacks being 'victims' and requiring help from the state. They believe they can help themselves, and don't feel like a victim.

I'm somewhere in the middle myself. The state may help, but it should not come to a point where people just don't have any initiative of their own, and basically depend on the state for a living (with the exclusion of course of people who can't take care of themselves because of whatever circumstances). Over here it was so bad at one point that it was often better to just not work at all, than to get a job, simply because it paid worse. So they changed the system to make you apply for a job at least once a month, to retain your unemployment benefits. I think that sort of initiative is good. Also, there once was a trend for doctors to very quickly disqualify people from working entirely. That has now been changed to a more gradual scale where medical conditions may prevent you from doing certain work, but not all work. So it's a 'partial disqualification'. I also think this is good. Too many people just want to be a 'victim' and sit around and do nothing all day. Just taking up the tax money from people who do want to work for a living and get ahead in life.

So I guess for me it boils down to people who need help because they CAN'T work, but not because they don't WANT TO work. And I guess that work-thing should bubble back to early in life. If people know they need to find a job later, they may spend more time getting a proper education in school (or at least their parents will push them to, because the parents themselves failed to get ahead in the world, and want to prevent their children from making the same mistake). I think that's why Asian cultures are currently so successful. These people have very good work ethic, and do well in school.

But he's not doing it for the reasons you think he is. What he believes changes from day to day. His narcissism is no longer a joke; it's a real, pathological mental illness at this point.

Perhaps not, but at least someone is defending the US and what it stands for.

And that's where we differ, and why we can't have a conversation.

Well, we could have a conversation, but that would require me to understand your position.

Some of these movements aren't about shutting down free speech; they're about giving a voice to oppressed people whose voice was ignored or suppressed.

That's what they think they're about. But my concern is:

- 1) I don't necessarily agree with the suppressions they claim
- 2) I definitely do not agree with the way they try to 'give a voice' to these people.

You literally can't have any conversation with these people. They simply do not accept any different opinions whatsoever. They just yell at you incessantly, call you a racist, fascist etc. They claim things like "words are violence". Which is nonsense. And once there are enough of them in any organization, they just bully people with different opinions out of that organization. And then we get to the part where they want to wipe out Western history. They want to "decolonize" science and education. They don't even know exactly what that would mean. But you get weird discussions on how Newton's contributions to science aren't relevant because he was white. They're basically just crazy, and if they get their way (like wiping out Newtonian knowledge and whatever else), they are going to do a lot of damage to civilization.

"There are two sides to every issue" is a dangerous philosophy. If you want to argue that all issues deserve debate, please tell me what the "other side" of racial prejudice is, or what the "other side" of transphobia is, etc.

I think you need to take a step back first. I mean, once you agree on the definition of 'racial prejudice' or 'transphobia', then I suppose virtually everyone would agree that these things are bad. But my issue is not with that. My issue is with the fact that they use 'racism' or 'transphobia' labels on many situations that simply do not fit the criteria.



The other day, there was this antiracism discussion on TV here. A black guy told some vague story about how he walked past a restaurant terrace, and he saw white people eating pizza and drinking wine. He said "I would like to do that too, but we just don't have that privilege".

That's just crazy. There's nothing stopping him from just sitting at a table there and ordering wine, pizza or whatever he wants. I mean, literally nothing, There never was. Apartheid? Some say it's a Dutch word, but it isn't. It's a South-African word. It never existed here in The Netherlands. At no time ever was there any kind of segregation anywhere in the Netherlands, with the exception of WWII, when the German occupiers would ban Jews from various places. But German occupation pretty much implies that this was not our idea, and obviously we turned that back as soon as we were freed from Nazi Germany.

So you see, I have issues with people talking about 'racial prejudice' like that. This is just racist propaganda. They are trying to put enough fake stories of racist encounters out, to make people doubt, and eventually believe that this kind of racism actually exists.

And then we're back to Nazi Germany (or Maoist China or Stalinist Russia): if you can make people believe in fake racism, you can also falsely label people as racists. And once you've labeled someone as a racist, you can take 'corrective action'.

Some people really do deserve to be shut down. Does *\*everyone\** deserve it? No, but if someone has been shut down, there is usually an overwhelmingly understandable and justifiable reason why it happened.

Well, more and more I fail to see good reasons why people are shut down.

Recently they even attacked RuPaul for being 'transphobic'. That's just crazy. The guy did a lot for gay rights and for promoting gay culture, such as drag queens.

Given his liberal attitude, it's very unlikely that he himself is gay and a drag queen, but would not tolerate trans people, let alone fear them (which is what transphobia literally means of course).

But what happened is that trans people wanted to be on his RuPaul's Drag Race show, and he declined, because he wanted to keep to the format of gay drag queens competing only.

I can understand his stance, because trans people come from a different angle than gay drag queens, and having a kind of competition between gay men and trans people will be more difficult. I guess his argument is similar to male and female athletes not competing directly in most sports, because of physical differences, which would lead to unfair advantages/disadvantages.

So here's this guy who's basically a 'hero' for the gay society, and he gets shot down by trans people who won't tolerate that his show has a certain format and he does not want to change it to include trans people. Trans people don't have a right to be on his show. It's not about 'trans rights'. It's not about 'transphobia'. It's about people who have a misplaced sense of entitlement, trying to force their demands on others.

My stance is that 'trans rights' is a meaningless term. To me, trans people are human, so they have human rights, the same as everyone else.

But I do feel that there's a side to 'trans people' that JK Rowling and/or others highlighted, which has some merit.

Namely, why are there suddenly so many 'trans' people? Are these people REALLY people who are 'born into the wrong body'? Or is it some kind of mental condition where they have trouble seeing themselves for who and what they are and accepting that?

A transformation is a very rigorous operation, and the surgery and hormone treatment will do irreversible damage to your body. There are various stories of people who transformed, and then found that it wasn't the answer to their problems. They only gained more problems. Some of them would 'detransform'. But the damage to their life and body was already done. In many cases the surgery and hormone treatment leads to chronic pain issues.

Another issue is, if you transform from male to female, biologically you're still mostly male, no matter how you try to slice it. Your cells still have XY chromosomes, like any regular male. It seems that many trans people can't accept the simple fact that they are NOT really a male or female. They're something in between. And people can't help but see them that way.

I mean, imagine I get out of my car. Someone comments: "Hey, nice car you have there!". And I say: "That's not a car, that's a bicycle! You insensitive twat!". And the guy says: "I'm sorry, it looked like a car to me, with the 4 wheels, a roof, the doors, the seats, the steering wheel etc". And I say: "No, it identifies as a bicycle. You can't call it a car, that's violence!".

I mean, that's basically what's happening here.

I certainly don't want to prevent people from being trans or anything, and I don't fear them. We have a famous Dutch trans person, Nikkie de Jager, aka NikkieTutorials on YouTube. It seems to have worked out for her, which I applaud. But technically you are a 'freak of nature', that's just a fact. You're not every bit as female as a real woman. And some people will point that out. You knew that before you made the transition. That's the choice you've made.

And then I don't even want to get into the people who are 'genderqueer', and invent tons of new 'genders' that normal people can't even keep up with. And then demand that people address them with the right pronouns and whatnot. Because otherwise they're being 'violent'.

Well, excuse me, but that's just a very difficult thing to do in various situations. We're talking about a world that has revolved around men and women for ages. All our language and institutions are based on that. And 99.999% of all people still fit in those two categories. This minority is trying to make demands that are not only unreasonable, but borderline insane, for reasons that most people simply can't even understand in the first place. Which brings us back to the earlier point that it may just be a mental condition. Similar to people who believe they're Napoleon or Jesus Christ. Should we adapt the world to what they think? Or should we try to treat them for the mental problems they are experiencing?

I mean, I don't know where the truth lies here exactly. What I do know is that the people I've seen trying to debate this issue, are clearly emotionally unstable and unhinged. They simply can't deal with certain facts or opinions, and all they can do is either get angry and insult the other party, or just cry. They don't have arguments or a coherent story. Just like a child that wants to have its way, no matter what. It feels like emotional/moral blackmail to me.

The same with racism. They now want to focus on slavery/colonialism. But they have no clue how small a part of the Dutch population was even in on this in the first place. It was just a handful of merchants with ships. Most of the Dutch population were poor workers/farm hands etc. They neither had any role in slavery/colonization, nor did they really benefit from it.

And in the present day they claim "white people benefit from the wealth that was gained on slavery and colonialism". This too needs to be nuanced.

Firstly, colonialism is not necessarily bad. I mean, sure, in the US, the native Indians were pushed back. However, in places where no people lived anyway, what harm was there to build cities and start trading there?

Not ALL wealth is the result of oppressing native people or using slaves.

In fact, the slave trade was only a small part of the total Dutch trade, and wasn't responsible for the majority of the wealth.

Besides, today EVERYONE benefits from this wealth. The claim that only white people would benefit is nonsense. Everyone has the same rights. All the more disingenuous that the black people who make such claims are successful people themselves, often even millionaires. They benefit a lot more from our wealth than the majority of the white population, and they know they have the same rights as we do.

And they even go as far as saying 'white people can't feel our pain'. Which to me is a thinly veiled racist comment. It basically states that white people are somehow insensitive compared to people of 'other races'. Aside from it being racist, I also think it is untrue. I think WWII is the ultimate proof of that. The allies were predominantly white, and did everything to stop the Nazis from killing the jews, and reinstating the jews in society. Even the state of Israel is a result of WWII. Giving the jews a place of their own, where they can live in peace.

Of course, Palestinians will have their own idea on it, but I think the intentions behind the state of Israel were good, and shows that white people are far from insensitive to racism and human suffering.

I have a reason for this, but am withholding it to prevent conflict between us. But if you want me to elaborate, I can.

If there's one thing you can say about the Dutch, it's that they are not easily offended.

We are a very open and direct nation. Foreigners may call it blunt. Advantage of a nation being blunt is that you're also used to others making blunt statements toward you. It gives one thick skin.

Especially among friends (which I consider we are), there is not that much chance of conflict. Only in exceptional cases where claims are highly unreasonable and very insulting.

---

Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 7:12 PM

It took me an hour to write all this, and it's exhausting, and I don't want to write that much again as I have to work to earn income, as well as try to help my own mental state which has been fragile the past 6 months, so I'd prefer to only respond to targeted questions in this specific thread of discussion if that's ok. Reply follows:

On 7/16/2020 4:17 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Not saying they'd be right. But I do think this time, Joe Biden is a very poor candidate. He seems too old, often seems absent-minded, gets his words mixed

But it doesn't matter, because another 4 years of Trump would be worse. I would honestly vote for a janitor for president if he were the opposing candidate. Trump simply must be removed from power; the amount of damage he's done to the country by intentionally dividing instead of trying to unite, will be felt for at least one generation.

If Biden is elected, it is likely he'll not complete a full 8 years, in which case I hope he picks a decent vice presidential candidate.

Aside from that, I'm not entirely sure what the Democrats want. BLM/Antifa hold Marxist/anarchist beliefs. Defunding the police is a bad idea, yet some Democrat-run cities are actually giving in to these demands and are defunding police. Like New York, where crime becomes a bigger problem as the police force gets smaller.

Defunding doesn't mean dismantling, nor does it mean less police. You may want to do more research on what people are actually asking for.

If electing a Democrat president means there will be more of that kind of nonsense, then it'd be very difficult for me to vote for that.

Luckily, you'll never have to find out since I think it is unlikely you'll vote in an American election :-)

Voting in presidential elections, as well as Senate and House elections, has \*never\* been about voting for the best candidate. It's about voting for the candidate who you hate \*less\*. There's never been an overwhelmingly correct choice. The only time that ever happened in the last 100 years was 1984, when Reagan (who was pleasant but a very ineffective president) had so much of the popular vote that his opponent won a single state and Reagan got the other 49. And that wasn't because Reagan was a good president, but rather because the economy was growing and people didn't want that to change.

But regardless, the situation is that he was charged in a case that was dismissed, and the only thing they have against him is his conduct in a case where he shouldn't have been charged in the first place. By that logic the pardon isn't that crazy.

An American president commuted the sentence of a person convicted by a jury of lying to shield that very president. That is a historic level of corruption, and I'm not sure you can spin that any other way. Was Stone innocent? Well, check this confession to a reporter: "He knows I was under enormous pressure to turn on him. It would have eased my situation considerably. But I didn't." That is an admission that he did have information and could have "turned" on the president. The entire thing is just disgusting.

I think you are (lightly) defending Trump because he's spoken out against things you also speak out against. That does not mean he is fit to be president.

Too many people just want to be a 'victim' and sit around and do nothing all day. Just taking up the tax money from people who do want to work for a living and get ahead in life.

I think everyone's situation is different, and it is not good to make generalizations. Do some people take advantage of the system? Of course. Do most? I don't know, and in the absence of information, I would like to believe that most people are good people. (Because believing the opposite is not a way I would want to live through life, or treating others.)

Perhaps not, but at least someone is defending the US and what it stands for.

That statement is quite ignorant of the bigger picture. From utterly insane promises to coal lobbyists/industries saying that he can switch America back to using coal to save their industry when the entire world is moving towards renewable energy sources, to denouncing health experts' advice on how to handle COVID and dividing the country instead of uniting it to slow down the spread, to putting personal interests above that of the people -- that is not defending the US and what it stands for. It is defending \*himself\* and what \*he\* stands for. Big difference.

You should read this: <https://www.mcsweeneys.net/articles/the-complete-listing-so-far-atrocities-1-796>  
And I mean, spend an hour and truly read every single one. And then afterwards tell me if you think Trump is actually "defending the US and what it stands for".

And that's where we differ, and why we can't have a conversation.

Well, we could have a conversation, but that would require me to understand your position.

Okay, if you ask me directly about a certain position I haven't made clear, I'll answer directly.

You literally can't have any conversation with these people. They simply do not accept any different opinions whatsoever. They just yell at you incessantly, call you a racist, fascist etc.

So, there are some people who think that racism is a nuanced, multi-faceted, complicated discussion with many sides. I think that's a waste of intelligence, to try to split hairs; I think people who try to break racism down into sub-categories and discuss it to death are trying to justify maintaining it to themselves. Racism is bad, end of story. There's no point in discussing it, just like there's no point in discussing completely obvious bad things like murder or rape. It's wrong.

Now, how to end racism? Lots of different opinions, obviously. But my view is this: If someone offers any opinion on ending racism that gets them yelled at, shut down, etc., then maybe the opinion they were offering was incredibly

stupid. You don't get shut down for making positive suggestions, only negative or dismissive ones.

| They claim things like "words are violence". Which is nonsense.

I suggest you watch stock footage of Klan rallies, or Hitler's speeches, before you back that statement. Words that promote violence absolutely can lead to violent acts.

| are enough of them in any organization, they just bully people with different opinions out of that organization.

I think there's a big difference between "different opinion" and "incredibly stupid and uninformed opinion". People don't get bullied out of organizations for offering up rational informed, positive/contributing opinions.

| But you get weird discussions on how Newton's contributions to science aren't relevant because he was white.

Citation needed.

Maybe they were denouncing Newton's theories on evolution or race, in which case it \*would\* be good to take a critical look at what he said, since he lived in an era where people believed black people were literally more advanced apes.

| But my issue is not with that. My issue is with the fact that they use 'racism' or 'transphobia' labels on many situations that simply do not fit the criteria.

That might be common in your country, but over here there is no question at all if the label has been applied correctly.

| The other day, there was this antiracism discussion on TV here. A black guy told some vague story about how he walked past a restaurant terrace, and he saw white people eating pizza and drinking wine. He said "I would like to do that too, but we just don't have that privilege".

...okay, so I read your story, and 1. That is a bit odd, and 2. That has never been what racism is like in the USA. It is extremely obvious here. Black people don't complain about not being able to eat in restaurants, they complain about being treated unfairly by police in some areas, for which there is a mountain of statistical and video evidence to support this.

So, what I think you're doing is thinking that the racism issues you're having in the Netherlands are the same as all over the world, and that's just not the case. So if you talk about things in a generalized fashion, you have to understand that it's only relevant to your country, and people from other countries are going to be confused since you're describing things that aren't universal.

| I can understand his stance, because trans people come from a different angle than gay drag queens, and having a kind of competition between gay men and trans people will be more difficult. I guess his argument is similar to male and female athletes not competing directly in most sports, because of physical differences, which would lead to unfair advantages/disadvantages.

Yes, I can understand this too, and I also agree with the sports issue. There are female fighters who transitioned to male when they were past puberty, and having them fight cisgender females is just wrong -- the bone density is greater in males, for example.

So yes, this is a group of people complaining they are excluded. But complaining is not the same as "shut down". I don't see Ru Paul's activities stopping any time soon.

| So here's this guy who's basically a 'hero' for the gay society

Well, be specific: He's a hero for the drag queen society, not necessarily for gay society. Very few gays are into drag. And, drag society is very small compared to all the gay men in the world.

| My stance is that 'trans rights' is a meaningless term. To me, trans people are human, so they have human rights, the same as everyone else.

Yes, but they're not always treated like humans.

I asked a trans person a related question about this very recently. This was the exchange:

Me: "My question is: Why should we refer to trans men and women as "trans men" or "trans women"? Why not just men and women? My view is that, once someone has transitioned, they're simply the new gender. Is calling (for example) a trans woman just a woman somehow bad or disrespectful? I'm asking because, to me, it seems actually \*more\* disrespectful to use the term "trans woman", etc. because you're explicitly calling out that they're transitioning or have transitioned, which I feel can be misconstrued as phobic or prejudiced."

Them: "Your first instinct is correct. We do and should refer to trans men and women as simply men and women in general. The 'trans' adjective is relevant when people are discussing specific issues relating to trans people (rights, healthcare, community) that require a distinction to be made."

But I do feel that there's a side to 'trans people' that JK Rowling and/or others highlighted, which has some merit. Namely, why are there suddenly so many 'trans' people? Are these people REALLY people who are 'born into the wrong body'? Or is it some kind of mental condition where they have trouble seeing themselves for who and what they are and accepting that?

You are seeing more because more people are having the courage to come out without the fear that they will be ostracized or mistreated. The actual percentages haven't changed, only the public information.

Another issue is, if you transform from male to female, biologically you're still mostly male, no matter how you try to slice it. Your cells still have XY chromosomes, like any regular male. It seems that many trans people can't accept the simple fact that they are NOT really a male or female. They're something in between. And people can't help but see them that way.

That is a big generalization, and "many" is less than 5%. Most people who make the very difficult transition (years of therapy before you qualify for surgery, at least in the USA) don't do so lightly.

I have a few trans friends who I've been very lucky to talk to about these subjects, and only recently do I understand their position (and dilemmas). My suggestion to you, to help understand why someone would do this, is to research "gender dysphoria" and read personal accounts of what gender dysphoria feels like. Here are some starting points:

<https://www.npr.org/sections/pictureshow/2020/06/30/883930251/documenting-gender-dysphoria>

<https://www.dailydot.com/irl/gender-dysphoria/>

It ranges from "I don't feel like I fit in into either group" to "I am afraid to enter bathrooms" to "I'm afraid to dress how I feel because my family will disown me" to many other things.

I was bullied as a child. I was beaten up once or twice a week for several years just because I liked nerdy things like computers. I am sympathetic to people who don't feel comfortable with their assigned gender.

I mean, imagine I get out of my car. Someone comments: "Hey, nice car you have there!". And I say: "That's not a car, that's a bicycle! You insensitive twat!". And the guy says: "I'm sorry, it looked like a car to me, with the 4 wheels, a roof, the doors, the seats, the steering wheel etc". And I say: "No, it identifies as a bicycle. You can't call it a car, that's violence!".

That's a bit extreme. I think you're harping on the extreme idiots out there, and assuming they're all like that.

There will always be a vocal minority in every group, because there are a lot of stupid people in the world who are too stupid to realize they're stupid, and are too stupid to be reasoned with. Don't make the mistake of thinking everyone in the group is like that.

And then I don't even want to get into the people who are 'genderqueer', and invent tons of new 'genders' that normal people can't even keep up with. And then demand that people address them with the right pronouns and whatnot.

I agree that gender should have four forms, based on simple logic: Male, Female, Both, Neither. The people you're referring to believe there should be multiple subgenres of Neither. It irritates me, but then again the people who sub-sub-subdivide musical genres/styles ("Outrun", "Darkwave", "Operatic combat death metal", etc.) also irritate me :-)

I can't change musical snobs, just like I can't change people who want multiple gradations to gender.

Which brings us back to the earlier point that it may just be a mental condition. Similar to people who believe they're Napoleon or Jesus Christ. Should we adapt the world to what they think? Or should we try to treat them for the mental problems they are experiencing?

For people experiencing gender dysphoria, adapting their bodies, and adapting the world to be kinder to their situation, \*IS\* treating them for what they're experiencing. (Unless you know of a better treatment than therapy, hormones, surgery, and not treating them like they're lesser damaged people)

Be careful how you word these things. Someone could extrapolate your words into "gay people are mentally ill and need conversion therapy".

I mean, I don't know where the truth lies here exactly. What I do know is that the people I've seen trying to debate this issue, are clearly emotionally unstable and unhinged. They simply can't deal with certain facts or opinions,

If that's the case, why spend mental energy even thinking about them? Because they're vocal enough to enact actual



change you don't agree with? Well, some things in life are unfair, and we just have to accept that.

The same with racism. They now want to focus on slavery/colonialism. But they have no clue how small a part of the Dutch population was even in on this in the first place. It was just a handful of merchants with ships. Most of the Dutch population were poor workers/farm hands etc.  
They neither had any role in slavery/colonization, nor did they really benefit from it.

This is a very Dutch problem, as I stated earlier. That's not at all what racism is like in the USA.

I have a reason for this, but am withholding it to prevent conflict between us. But if you want me to elaborate, I can.

If there's one thing you can say about the Dutch, it's that they are not easily offended. We are a very open and direct nation. Foreigners may call it blunt. Advantage of a nation being blunt is that you're also used to others making blunt statements toward you. It gives one thick skin. Especially among friends (which I consider we are), there is not that much chance of conflict. Only in exceptional cases where claims are highly unreasonable and very insulting.

Okay, I'll elaborate: I think you were shunned/banned/not welcome etc. from some forums not because of your opinions, but because of how you conveyed them. I have seen you use wording that comes across as very pretentious, dismissive, superior, holier-than-thou, and even somewhat repulsive at times. If you're going to communicate to a world audience, you need to be diplomatic and be mindful of how your words sound outside of your culture. If someone is factually wrong, there are ways to convey that without making the person feel like you think they're stupid.

Also, I wouldn't hide behind "we Dutch are open and direct and blunt". Being blunt doesn't mean you have the right to be dismissive and condescending without repercussions. I had an argument once with someone being a jerk and his defense was "I'm from New Jersey, we're blunt and speak our mind." That's not always something to be proud of, and it's neither a defense, nor a justification, for being an utterly gigantic asshole. (I lived in New Jersey for 6 years, and it certainly didn't give me the right to talk down to people.)

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 11:18 PM

On Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 7:12 PM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org> wrote:

It took me an hour to write all this, and it's exhausting, and I don't want to write that much again as I have to work to earn income, as well as try to help my own mental state which has been fragile the past 6 months, so I'd prefer to only respond to targeted questions in this specific thread of discussion if that's ok.

Yea, no problem, you can respond when, where and how you choose.

I just think that there are some interesting yet strange schemes at work in the world today, and they mostly seem to come from the US. So you're a bit 'ahead of the curve', and I wonder what your views and experiences are.

But it doesn't matter, because another 4 years of Trump would be worse. I would honestly vote for a janitor for president if he were the opposing candidate. Trump simply must be removed from power; the amount of damage he's done to the country by intentionally dividing instead of trying to unite, will be felt for at least one generation.

I agree that the country appears to be more divided than ever. But I'm not entirely sure to what extent this is Trump's fault, and to what extent it is the result of the Democrats running an ongoing hate and smear campaign against Trump.

If Biden is elected, it is likely he'll not complete a full 8 years, in which case I hope he picks a decent vice presidential candidate.

If Biden is elected, at least the Democrats will stop their hate and smear campaign. Of course it remains to be seen if that helps anything, because it might just start a hate and smear campaign from the Republican side instead.

Defunding doesn't mean dismantling, nor does it mean less police. You may want to do more research on what people are actually asking for.

See, there's the problem. If I argue something, I get vague responses "It doesn't mean what you think it means, but we're not going to tell you what we actually DO mean".

I did look it up, and defunding literally means that: less funds to the police, and allocate it to other causes instead.

Less funds to police inevitably leads to the police force shrinking in manpower, equipment etc (if not, that requires explanation). Which we've already seen in certain cities, as I already said.  
I think you can only defund the police if you can get crime rates down first. Not the other way around (investing in the community in other ways will take years for results to emerge, if at all).

An American president commuted the sentence of a person convicted by a jury of lying to shield that very president. That is a historic level of corruption, and I'm not sure you can spin that any other way. Was Stone innocent? Well, check this confession to a reporter: "He knows I was under enormous pressure to turn on him. It would have eased my situation considerably. But I didn't." That is an admission that he did have information and could have "turned" on the president. The entire thing is just disgusting.

Well, assuming "turned on" meaning that he legitimately had information to spill on Trump (and even then there's this legal concept of 'fishing expedition'. Just because there may be dirt to find on someone somewhere doesn't mean you're always legitimized to find it).

If instead he means they were trying to force a (false?) confession out of him by putting pressure on him, then it's a different story.

From what I understood, he lied about having contact with Wikileaks. From that little information I can't make out what Trump's role in this is, and how he may or may not have been affected.

Anyway, I looked at it in some more detail, and as I understand, Trump gave 'commutation', not a 'pardon'. The difference is that the former does not erase the criminal record. It merely invalidates the sentence of the court case because the president has decided that the trial has been unfair (which may actually be true, I cannot judge that). The justice department can re-try the case.

So it's very difficult for me to judge.

I think you are (lightly) defending Trump because he's spoken out against things you also speak out against. That does not mean he is fit to be president.

I try to find a nuance.

Clearly he's not fit to be a president. But he doesn't do it all by himself. He has a team of advisors. So I still think it's possible that not everything he says and does is bad or evil. And even if he does the right things for the wrong reasons, he's still doing the right things. I could be wrong.

You should read this:

<https://www.mcsweeneys.net/articles/the-complete-listing-so-far-atrocities-1-796>

And I mean, spend an hour and truly read every single one. And then afterwards tell me if you think Trump is actually "defending the US and what it stands for".

But that was not the context in which I made that statement. I was only referring to him addressing freedom of speech, cancel culture, destruction of history, and more recently also the academic world, which has become a pool of extreme leftism (see the Evergreen State College, and how it spread from there to other universities and also into organizations as the graduates left university).

So, there are some people who think that racism is a nuanced, multi-faceted, complicated discussion with many sides. I think that's a waste of intelligence, to try to split hairs; I think people who try to break racism down into sub-categories and discuss it to death are trying to justify maintaining it to themselves. Racism is bad, end of story. There's no point in discussing it, just like there's no point in discussing completely obvious bad things like murder or rape. It's wrong.

It's not about splitting hairs. You can't have a conversation if you don't agree on definitions. And that's partly where the danger is here. They use 'racism' as a vague umbrella term. Even moreso 'institutional racism'.

Even the George Floyd thing is suspect. Was he black? Yes. Was the cop white? Yes. Does that prove that the murder had a racist motive? No it doesn't.

Yet everyone assumes this as fact. Then they extrapolate this to all cops. So all cops have racist motives to murder black people all the time. Based on essentially nothing.

You see, if the foundation for something is this shaky, I don't want to go along for the ride.

To me, racism is what Amnesty International defines it as:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/discrimination/>

"Racism affects virtually every country in the world. It systematically denies people their full human rights just because of their colour, race, ethnicity, descent (including caste) or national origin."

(and in the Dutch definition it doesn't even include national origin, as a nationality is not the same as a race).

When you deliberately keep terms such as 'institutional' and 'racism' vague, then you can move the goalposts anytime. It feels like a conspiracy theory. There is some vague 'institutional racism' thing out there somewhere, but nobody quite knows what it looks like, where it is, etc. But trust me, it's there! And if you dare to even question it, you're a racist too!

I'm not even questioning whether 'institutional racism' exists. I mean, surely it will exist for some definition of the term. But I want a definition first before you start accusing people. I can't agree or disagree with you on a subject if I don't know the definition of that subject. It's as simple as that.

And the fact that every single time I asked someone to explain 'institutional racism' to me, I was met with complete silence, I am more and more of the opinion that it indeed is more mass hysteria than there is actual substance to the claims.

As I said before, making vague accusations against people is exactly what the Nazis, Mao and Stalin did. What is the next step?

I suggest you watch stock footage of Klan rallies, or Hitler's speeches, before you back that statement. Words that promote violence absolutely can lead to violent acts.

Oh please. Firstly I am obviously aware of Klan rallies and Hitler's speeches. Secondly, that is not at all what I said. They literally say "words are violence". And they mean that in normal, civil conversation, just when a certain word does not fit with their twisted world view.

Just watch this: <https://youtu.be/WftZPL-k7Y?t=838>

She, sorry, they literally say that: "...and that is actually an act of violence".

That is what I mean. The guy is in no way promoting violence. It's just that this generation apparently has redefined language and what it means to use words. It makes it pretty much impossible to reason with these people.

I think there's a big difference between "different opinion" and "incredibly stupid and uninformed opinion". People don't get bullied out of organizations for offering up rational informed, positive/contributing opinions.

Actually, they do. Did you not catch the buzz about Bari Weiss leaving the New York Times?

<https://www.bariweiss.com/resignation-letter>

She (and I may call her her that) doesn't have an "incredibly stupid and uninformed opinion". She's not some right-wing nut. She's not a fascist or a racist. Yet she was actually called a Nazi. She's Jewish for crying out loud! They're calling a Jewish person a Nazi, simply for having a different opinion.

So yes, people DO get bullied out of organizations for offering up rational informed, positive/contributing opinions.

As she says, she did get private messages from colleagues who supported her, but were too afraid to speak up, in fear of also losing their jobs.

And as you see, they use labels like 'racism' for it, getting back to the constantly shifting definition of the term, and it being applied to anyone they want to get rid of for whatever reason.

Which is especially damning, since it's a large newspaper, that's supposed to strive for balanced and objective journalism. Instead they're just selling a narrative. And if you don't play along, they just get rid of you.

Citation needed.

Maybe they were denouncing Newton's theories on evolution or race, in which case it \*would\* be good to take a critical look at what he said, since he lived in an era where people believed black people were literally more advanced apes.

Some criticism on Newton is mentioned in this article for example:

<https://quilllette.com/2020/06/20/exploring-other-ways-of-knowing-the-new-religious-threat-to-science-education/>

In this case it is from a feminist standpoint, so Newton is bad because he's a male too.

"This method of criticism has led, for example, to such oddities as feminist philosopher of science Sandra Harding's suggestion that Newton's laws might be accurately referred to as "Newton's rape manual." These critiques were once confined to social commentary that was distinct from the actual work of scientists. As I've learned first-hand, that may be changing."

The quote is real, here's an actual scan from the page of Sandra Harding's book:

<https://www.stephenicks.org/2017/06/24/newtons-principia-as-a-rape-manual/>

Here is a paper that claims that Newton based his work on Indian principles which he 'poorly understood': <http://ckraju.net/papers/uct-panel-decolonising-science-ckr-summary.pdf>  
Not sure if that's even true in the first place.

But eventually that leads to people devaluing Newton's work more and more.

And then you get idiots like this: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C9SiRNibD14>

She literally reduces Newton's contribution to 'seeing an apple fall'. No, he was the one (that we know of at least), who formulated the laws of gravity, and ways to calculate things. Maybe people in other parts of the world had similar understanding of maths and physics. Thing is, apparently it hasn't stood the test of time, if it were true. So Newton's

laws are the only ones that survived to this day. That's why we use them. And when we use them, we don't care that it was Newton who derived them, or that he was white, or European or whatever. But apparently these people see things differently, to put it mildly.

And to get back to what you said: it isn't even about what Newton said. It is about what he is: a white male. The worst kind of human there is.

That might be common in your country, but over here there is no question at all if the label has been applied correctly.

Well I think I've proven you wrong with some of the links above.

> The other day, there was this antiracism discussion on TV here. A black guy  
> told some vague story about how he walked past a restaurant terrace, and he  
> saw white people eating pizza and drinking wine. He said "I would like to do  
> that too, but we just don't have that privilege".

...okay, so I read your story, and 1. That is a bit odd, and 2. That has never been what racism is like in the USA. It is extremely obvious here.

The point is, it is EXACTLY what racism was like in the USA. Before the 1960s that is, when the civil rights movement made great strides in changing that.

But it NEVER was what racism was like over here. And certainly not in 2020. The guy is literally full of shit, and is pushing some agenda. Question is, what is the exact agenda he's pushing, and why is he pushing it?

Black people don't complain about not being able to eat in restaurants, they complain about being treated unfairly by police in some areas, for which there is a mountain of statistical and video evidence to support this.

They tried to push that narrative over here as well. Not sure why they even try. We get 3 to 5 people killed by police yearly. That's such a small number that it's even statistically irrelevant to try to group the deaths by race. Let alone to try and claim that the police would actively try to kill people of a certain race. I mean, if you're only going to do it with max 3-5 people a year, that's not going to put a dent in anything, is it?

Even in the US I think there's a lot more nuance to the situation than some sources give us (and going back to the above Bari Weiss situation, clearly the media are pushing a narrative as well, they have an agenda).

So, what I think you're doing is thinking that the racism issues you're having in the Netherlands are the same as all over the world, and that's just not the case.

No, you have it backwards, as I said. There are people trying to project situations from the US to Dutch society. Which doesn't work.

So I'm not the one who thinks that (as I already said before), but these people with the fake racism stories think that.

They also use ideas from Robin DiAngelo's White Fragility, and other fraudulent sources. One weird thing is that they are literally calling us 'wit' now, which is a direct translation of the English colour 'white'.

We never used that to describe skin tones. The proper Dutch term is 'blank'.

This feels like the reverse of using 'nigger' to refer to black people. They have chosen a term to refer to white people that the people themselves are uncomfortable with, and is not the proper term.

So if you talk about things in a generalized fashion, you have to understand that it's only relevant to your country, and people from other countries are going to be confused since you're describing things that aren't universal.

Excuse me, but do you realize you're talking to me as if I'm a child? You can assume I know and understand all this, and more.

So yes, this is a group of people complaining they are excluded. But complaining is not the same as "shut down". I don't see Ru Paul's activities stopping any time soon.

No, unlike Bari Weiss, RuPaul cannot be shut down that easily. Although, create a big enough shitstorm around his character, and you may be able to influence the sponsors of his show/network to retract their sponsor deals, and cancel the program. This has happened with a popular program over here recently.

Well, be specific: He's a hero for the drag queen society, not necessarily

for gay society. Very few gays are into drag. And, drag society is very small compared to all the gay men in the world.

No, we don't have to be more specific than what I said.

RuPaul has been openly gay for decades, and has fought for gay rights and the general acceptance of gays, gay marriage and all that.

Drag is just one thing he does, some of the time.

You are seeing more because more people are having the courage to come out without the fear that they will be ostracized or mistreated. The actual percentages haven't changed, only the public information.

That is your opinion. I don't share it. I think there are various other possible explanations, including bad parenting, the use of medication from a young age, the fact that trans has become somewhat of a 'fad'.

So I think it's a combination of factors. More 'real' trans people may be coming out of the closet, but I also think that some 'confused' people jump on the bandwagon for whatever reason.

It ranges from "I don't feel like I fit in into either group" to "I am afraid to enter bathrooms" to "I'm afraid to dress how I feel because my family will disown me" to many other things.

Yes, but no matter how much of that I will read, I will never be able to understand it. It is real in their minds. But I have no idea what that would feel like, or what would cause you to feel like that.

So I simply can't know whether their feelings are the feelings of a sane person, and their physical presence needs to be changed to fit their feelings. Or whether their feelings are delusional, and they'd be better off trying to change the feelings rather than their body.

I guess in the old days you simply wouldn't have the option for surgery and hormone treatment, so there could be only one possible answer.

I was bullied as a child. I was beaten up once or twice a week for several years just because I liked nerdy things like computers. I am sympathetic to people who don't feel comfortable with their assigned gender.

That's interesting. Because you never decided to get hormone treatment or surgery to like anything other than computers, right?

I mean, I suppose you were comfortable with who you were. The problem was more about others bullying you for who you were.

I'm not sure if a transformation is the right way to get away from bullies, to put it mildly.

That's a bit extreme. I think you're harping on the extreme idiots out there, and assuming they're all like that.

Well, it seems that they're the vocal ones, and the 'true' trans people are getting annoyed by these 'imposters'. But well, the video I linked above shows you exactly how it goes. And she was mildly reasonable. There's lots of videos of Social Justice Warriors out there, many of them not making a lot of sense, but having a lot of anger.

There will always be a vocal minority in every group, because there are a lot of stupid people in the world who are too stupid to realize they're stupid, and are too stupid to be reasoned with. Don't make the mistake of thinking everyone in the group is like that.

Again, I don't, don't treat me like a child who doesn't know this.

But talking about cancel culture, it's these people who do it. This crazy vocal minority with a crazy "Critical theory" world view on race, gender, and various other issues.

Be careful how you word these things. Someone could extrapolate your words into "gay people are mentally ill and need conversion therapy".

Heh, gay hasn't been an issue in my country for decades. We were the first to have a legal gay marriage in 2001, remember (full-blown marriage, completely equal to regular marriage, not just registered partnership)? The gay community uses wooden shoes as the icon of gay marriage.

I don't think gay people are mentally ill, and never did. But I think they're an entirely different 'class' of people than the trans community. In fact it seems like the gay community doesn't quite like being lumped in with the current trans/genderqueer stuff.

Gay people just like other people of the same sex, but otherwise go about their own business. They don't try to change society to fit their image. Recently, Halle Berry was attacked on social media for considering a role playing a trans person. They thought only trans actors should be allowed to play trans roles.

But acting is make-believe. As an actor you always play someone that you're not. There have been straight actors playing gay characters, and I don't recall the gay community ever being bothered by that. And why should they? As



long as the portrayal is accurate and respectful, there's nothing wrong with it. Straight people aren't bothered with gay actors playing straight roles either, are they? There's just a mutual trust, respect and understanding. But that is lacking with these people.

If that's the case, why spend mental energy even thinking about them? Because they're vocal enough to enact actual change you don't agree with? Well, some things in life are unfair, and we just have to accept that.

It's not about whether I agree or not. It's about them attacking people in droves, calling their employers, trying to get them fired etc.

I personally don't care if you're straight, gay, trans or whatever. As long as we can get along with mutual trust, respect and understanding.

But if you constantly change the rules of the game, and attack people who aren't even aware that they're not playing along properly, that's a problem.

I think we are dealing with a generation of deluded, overly entitled, spoilt brats.

This is a very Dutch problem, as I stated earlier. That's not at all what racism is like in the USA.

Again, it's the US plantation slavery projected onto Dutch society. The UN now calls for us to put more slavery/colonization into our educational programs:

<https://www.ad.nl/binnenland/dat-witte-nederlanders-profiteerden-van-uitbuiting-moet-in-lesstof~ab6b8a13/>

(It's in Dutch, can't find an English source).

That report is basically full of lies and nonsense (and that lady has a very dubious background anyway, she even supported Robert Mugabe). It also completely ignores the fact that there's a whole lot on slavery/colonization in the current educational programs already.

But, if you're just trying to push an agenda, you don't need to bother with things such as facts.

Okay, I'll elaborate: I think you were shunned/banned/not welcome etc. from some forums not because of your opinions, but because of how you conveyed them. I have seen you use wording that comes across as very pretentious, dismissive, superior, holier-than-thou, and even somewhat repulsive at times. If you're going to communicate to a world audience, you need to be diplomatic and be mindful of how your words sound outside of your culture. If someone is factually wrong, there are ways to convey that without making the person feel like you think they're stupid.

Okay, I appreciate your view on the matter. Your assessment is correct, but in my experience it's a case of action-reaction.

I basically keep a scoreboard of people I interact with. I guess you can say it's like a "three strikes and you're out"-policy.

You're allowed to peacefully disagree, and you may present your facts and arguments in a civilized manner.

Everytime you don't (basically everytime they are the ones being pretentious, dismissive etc, and try to make me feel stupid), you get a strike. Eventually all your strikes are up, and I lose patience. If you don't want to be civil with me, then I don't have to be civil with you either. If you can't peacefully have a conversation and exchange arguments and viewpoints, then fine, I'll just bluntly back up my view with facts and argumentation, and I can make you look like a total idiot most of the time, because I'm just much better prepared than most people. But you asked for it. And if someone else had corrected that person for his behaviour towards me first, it would never have to come this far.

For me, it's not a popularity contest, and I don't feel like being diplomatic. I just lay down the facts to like-minded people, so we can all enjoy our hobby and further our art.

But I guess it's the same with cancel culture now: the vocal minority can get away with it, because nobody dares to stand up to the people under attack.

---

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 11:27 PM

Oh, and check some pictures from the early 20th century from The Netherlands.

This is what the average worker's life REALLY looked like. Yes they were all white, because as I said, we didn't have people of other colour before roughly 1950. Is that white privilege? Does this look like people who enriched themselves massively from slavery and colonization? The lack of historical sense is just preposterous. Now I come from regular working class, people like this. And these people are now insulting me because I "have white privilege" and "profited from slave trade". And I have to kneel for these idiots, and apologize? I, my ancestors, and most of the Dutch population, had nothing to do with the slave trade at all, and lived in poverty. There was a small rich elite, that my ancestors weren't part of. I'm not going to apologize for the colour of my skin. I didn't choose that, nor did they. Other than that, my ancestors may have had a slightly better standard of living than outright slavery, but it wasn't exactly wealth. And whatever they owned, they earned with hard work, not with slavery and colonies.





[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 2:42 AM

On 7/16/2020 4:27 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Is that white privilege? Does this look like people who enriched themselves massively from slavery and colonization?

No, but that's not what white privilege means. White privilege means the inherent advantages a white person has in a society characterized by racial inequality and injustice. It's the privileges a white person has in society today, right now. I wasn't born into a rich family either, but I certainly have white privilege due to my race. From Cory Collins: "white privilege is not the assumption that everything a white person has accomplished is unearned; most white people who have reached a high level of success worked extremely hard to get there. Instead, white privilege should be viewed as a built-in advantage, separate from one's level of income or effort."

In the Netherlands, I'm sure this is a debate. In the USA, it's not. For example, I don't get randomly pulled over by cops. I carpooled with a black coworker for three weeks 22 years ago, and twice in those three weeks he was pulled over by a cop for essentially no reason. Both times when the cop saw me in the passenger seat, he let my coworker go with just a warning for some made-up issue with the car.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 11:02 AM

You focus on white privilege. I'm saying they're trying to put the blame of slavery on us, and are pushing for reparations. White privilege is just the start of their huge conspiracy theory against white people to build up a feeling of guilt to eventually get them to pay money for things they never did. What makes it even worse is that a significant number of these activists are not even descendants of slaves themselves. Oh no, they are literally descendants of African slave trading tribes.

And the problem with white privilege or institutional racism etc is always that it's anecdotal. Yea, maybe the cop really did pull over the car for no reason. Or maybe the car really did look dingy and faulty, and the cop wanted to have a closer look. Maybe a similar car was recently used in a crime. Maybe that one cop happened to be a racist, but none of his colleagues on the force were.

Maybe they have a reason for pulling over black people more often, because statistics show that they are more often involved in crime, more often carry firearms, and are more likely to use violence.

I don't know. You could read too much into a cop pulling over a black guy, or you could read too little into it. You see, that's the narrative they're selling, and if you go along with it, it can easily be blown up by just a few bits of anecdotal evidence (like the example of George Floyd, we simply don't know whether there was a racial motive).

I think there may be a few racist cops out there, but the majority isn't (at least not anti-black racism, given that a large part of the police force is black). So I will never buy into a narrative where the police force is some state-organized way to "put the black man down". I think black people are involved in considerably more crime than white people, percentually. So I think the police have a difficult task of keeping the neighbourhood safe.

What you describe could also be psychological: it could be that cops do keep to a policy to pull black people over more often. That way they signal to black criminals: "Be careful, we're watching you". And that is sad, because the good guys have to suffer under the bad guys.

So as long as black people are just pulled over more often, but if they're innocent, they're not actually booked on anything, or threatened in any way, it could be that. Now if they actually write tickets without reason, or arrest black people without reason, that would be a different story.

We have a similar thing, where Turkish and Moroccan people are watched more closely by the police. For good reason, because literally half our prisons are filled with these immigrants, even though they're only about 4% of the total population. So they are insanely overrepresented in crime. Which poses a real problem for the police. It may not be entirely ethical, but the crime figures pretty much warrants watching them more closely, because they are THAT much more criminal. The police do have a job to try and keep the streets safe. So they have to go where crime takes them.

We have a weekly show, that shows footage of crimes, trying to track down the suspects. Nearly ALL suspects are Turkish/Moroccan. Every week. That's not racism, that's the grim reality.

Trying to frame that as "white privilege" is just sad. What it is: "Give your children a proper education, and keep them on the straight and narrow". Because so many blacks don't, it's come to a point where you always have to be suspect of them.

It's not white privilege, because whites aren't the only ones who manage. Asians generally do fine, very little Asian crime here. And there are many examples of Turks and Moroccans who managed to avoid the crime trap, and build up a decent career.

And the blacks (as in people of African descent) over here are not very active in crime either. So we have a similar situation, just with Turkish/Moroccan immigrants, rather than black people.

The main difference is that we have strict gun control laws, and our police can only use their guns in extreme situations (and when they do, there is ALWAYS an investigation, regardless of whether you even hit someone, just firing your gun is enough). Which means our police rarely ever kills a suspect. Now that is something that the US could work towards.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 12:05 PM

I guess this shows what the problem is: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xyTTxWtOBZM>

White people have really weird ideas about the police and black people, seem to be totally out of touch with reality. Black people don't want to abolish the police, they trust the police, and think it's necessary to keep things somewhat under control.

Basically they're saying exactly what I said.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 8:19 PM

I'm done talking about this. I don't want to get so upset that I lose months off the end of my life being at maximum stress writing a 2 hour rebuttal to these conversations, then feeling anxious about it all weekend afterwards. Your views are opposite from mine, and I can't give you any information about an opposite viewpoint that you accept, so there's no point in continuing. Likewise, I doubt there's any way I could move closer to your views, because there are some concepts I feel aren't worth debating, as any sort of intellectual or philosophical debate about those subjects diminishes the dignity and humanity of the subjects involved.

I am guessing you feel this is me "shutting down the debate", which was one of your original complaints about vocal movements on social media. I don't see it that way; I am simply leaving the conversation after understanding what your views are and realizing there is too great a difference between our views to come to any sort of agreement about these subjects. So I'd rather not continue, and work on demos instead.

I'm guessing this is frustrating to you. Since it's clear you feel very strongly about these subjects, you may want to get involved in your local government, journalism, or some other national movement, to actively work towards the change you feel should happen. Maybe volunteer at the offices of political opponents who support your views, and help them get elected. Or perhaps write and publish essays on these subjects.

On 7/17/2020 4:02 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:



You focus on white privilege. I'm saying they're trying to put the blame of slavery on us, and are pushing for reparations. White privilege is just the start of their huge conspiracy theory against white people to build up a feeling of guilt to eventually get them to pay money for things they never did. What makes it even worse is that a significant number of these activists are not even descendants of slaves themselves. Oh no, they are literally descendants of African slave trading tribes.

And the problem with white privilege or institutional racism etc is always that it's anecdotal. Yea, maybe the cop really did pull over the car for no reason. Or maybe the car really did look dingy and faulty, and the cop wanted to have a closer look. Maybe a similar car was recently used in a crime. Maybe that one cop happened to be a racist, but none of his colleagues on the force were.

Maybe they have a reason for pulling over black people more often, because statistics show that they are more often involved in crime, more often carry firearms, and are more likely to use violence.

I don't know. You could read too much into a cop pulling over a black guy, or you could read too little into it. You see, that's the narrative they're selling, and if you go along with it, it can easily be blown up by just a few bits of anecdotal evidence (like the example of George Floyd, we simply don't know whether there was a racial motive).

I think there may be a few racist cops out there, but the majority isn't (at least not anti-black racism, given that a large part of the police force is black). So I will never buy into a narrative where the police force is some state-organized way to "put the black man down". I think black people are involved in considerably more crime than white people, percentually. So I think the police have a difficult task of keeping the neighbourhood safe.

What you describe could also be psychological: it could be that cops do keep to a policy to pull black people over more often. That way they signal to black criminals: "Be careful, we're watching you". And that is sad, because the good guys have to suffer under the bad guys.

So as long as black people are just pulled over more often, but if they're innocent, they're not actually booked on anything, or threatened in any way, it could be that. Now if they actually write tickets without reason, or arrest black people without reason, that would be a different story.

We have a similar thing, where Turkish and Moroccan people are watched more closely by the police. For good reason, because literally half our prisons are filled with these immigrants, even though they're only about 4% of the total population. So they are insanely overrepresented in crime. Which poses a real problem for the police. It may not be entirely ethical, but the crime figures pretty much warrants watching them more closely, because they are THAT much more criminal. The police do have a job to try and keep the streets safe. So they have to go where crime takes them.

We have a weekly show, that shows footage of crimes, trying to track down the suspects. Nearly ALL suspects are Turkish/Moroccan. Every week. That's not racism, that's the grim reality.

Trying to frame that as "white privilege" is just sad. What it is is: "Give your children a proper education, and keep them on the straight and narrow". Because so many blacks don't, it's come to a point where you always have to be suspect of them.

It's not white privilege, because whites aren't the only ones who manage. Asians generally do fine, very little Asian crime here. And there are many examples of Turks and Moroccans who managed to avoid the crime trap, and build up a decent career.

And the blacks (as in people of African descent) over here are not very active in crime either. So we have a similar situation, just with Turkish/Moroccan immigrants, rather than black people.

The main difference is that we have strict gun control laws, and our police can only use their guns in extreme situations (and when they do, there is ALWAYS an investigation, regardless of whether you even hit someone, just firing your gun is enough). Which means our police rarely ever kills a suspect. Now that is something that the US could work towards.

On Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 2:42 AM Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>> wrote:

On 7/16/2020 4:27 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

- > Is that white privilege? Does this look like people who enriched
- > themselves massively from slavery and colonization?

No, but that's not what white privilege means. White privilege means the inherent advantages a white person has in a society characterized by racial inequality and injustice. It's the privileges a white person has in society today, right now. I wasn't born into a rich family either, but I certainly have white privilege due to my race. From Cory Collins: "white privilege is not the assumption that everything a white person has accomplished is unearned; most white people who have reached a high level of success worked extremely hard to get there. Instead, white privilege should be viewed as a built-in advantage, separate from one's level of income or effort."

In the Netherlands, I'm sure this is a debate. In the USA, it's not. For example, I don't get randomly pulled over by cops. I carpooled with a black coworker for three weeks 22 years ago, and twice in those three weeks he was



pulled over by a cop for essentially no reason. Both times when the cop saw me in the passenger seat, he let my coworker go with just a warning for some made-up issue with the car.

-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)  
Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>  
A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>  
You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Sat, Jul 18, 2020 at 7:22 PM

I could go into detail, but I think the core of the point is: YOU need to feel strongly about these subjects, and YOU need to get involved. That is, if you want to hang on to Western civilization as we know it, with its values, tolerance, understanding, the possibilities it creates, and how it has pushed civilization, technology, social standards etc forward for centuries.

You can't sit by the sidelines and point to others to fight your battles for you. There's too many people sitting by the sidelines, and a small group of revolutionaries is taking advantage of that.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>

Sat, Jul 18, 2020 at 11:35 PM

On 7/18/2020 12:22 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

I could go into detail, but I think the core of the point is: YOU need to feel strongly about these subjects, and YOU need to get involved.

But isn't that encouraging me to fight for things you don't want?

want to hang on to Western civilization as we know it, with its values, tolerance, understanding, the possibilities it creates, and how it has pushed civilization, technology, social standards etc forward for centuries.

I don't see these movements as threatening civilization and technology; I see letting things go on the way they have been as the real threat. I do see them as threatening values and social standards, but I feel those need to change anyway.

As for threatening tolerance and understanding, I don't think bigotry and police brutality need tolerance and understanding. Some subjects don't require, or deserve, a multi-faceted debate. Does that sound elitist? Probably, but there's a reason why:

Are there stupid people in massive groups in the Netherlands? I'm not suggesting you're stupid, and I'm asking quite seriously, as I don't know. In the USA, we have huge groups of utterly stupid people, usually in the southern areas, where it's impossible to educate them, or have any sort of debate, because they don't understand basic facts. Worse, it's their culture to take \*joy\* in being ignorant. When these people are on the opposite side of what you'd think would be a common sense argument ("Don't discriminate", "Wear a mask", etc.) it is so grueling to try to talk to them, so draining and depressing, that many just give up, myself included. So, I'm just curious if the Netherlands has the same problem (it doesn't sound like you do).

You can't sit by the sidelines and point to others to fight your battles for you. There's too many people sitting by the sidelines, and a small group of revolutionaries is taking advantage of that.

I have never claimed I wanted to sit on the sidelines and have others to work for me. I'm Generation X; I'm perfectly happy just sitting on the sidelines and watching the world burn. :-) Things may bother me, but they haven't bothered me enough to do anything other than vote with my ballot and my money. That's not changing for me any time soon, and probably never, since I don't have much time left on the planet anyway.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Sat, Jul 18, 2020 at 11:54 PM

Do you have any idea what's been going on in CHAZ/CHOP? Or what has been going on in Portland, and is still going on?

Because I see things like this: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qtddg2KVV-o&feature=youtu.be>

BLM/Antifa 'activists' are basically terrorizing and destroying cities. Cities run by democrats, which is probably no coincidence. The democrats let this happen. Why? Because they probably know they don't stand a chance against the Republicans in a regular election. They're basically trying to create a civil war, and blame Trump for the unrest, to try and unseat him this way.

The mainstream media are playing along, mostly. They haven't reported AT ALL on Portland in the past 50 days (even though it's been all over Twitter and YouTube for people to see, and also picked up by smaller media, who aren't under the leftist thumb).

But as soon as Trump sent in the troops (which he has a right to, since they were attacking federal buildings, and local authorities were unable to defend the federal property), they are now reporting on Portland like crazy, and framing everything as if Trump is trying to overthrow local government and be a dictator. They claim that Trump is using Portland as a test case to see how far he can go.

This has nothing to do with racism. This is a civil war, BLM/Antifa are trying to create some kind of Marxist/anarchist state, and the democrats are actually encouraging them.

So far that is what it looks like to me, at any rate. I don't see Trump trying to overthrow the country, I see him restoring law and order in places that have gone to hell, literally. What happens in the coming days will tell us if I'm right or not. I expect Trump to restore law and order, so I expect that once the activists have been dispersed, the troops will either just leave, or they will remain to guard the property, but will not engage in any action unless specifically provoked.

Let's just hope I'm not wrong. But the alternative seems worse. A country where police is defunded and extreme leftist mobs rule.

We've had Marxism in Europe, I've seen what it does to countries and people. It's not pretty. I really think Trump is the lesser of two evils here, because the democrats just let these activists run rampant.

I guess my message to you is: try to figure out what exactly is happening in the country, and try to make the proper decision for the future.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:02 AM

On 7/18/2020 4:54 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

This has nothing to do with racism. This is a civil war, BLM/Antifa are trying to create some kind of Marxist/anarchist state, and the democrats are actually encouraging them.

They are reacting against a fascist state. Which is worse?

We've had Marxism in Europe, I've seen what it does to countries and people. It's not pretty. I really think Trump is the lesser of two evils here, because the democrats just let these activists run rampant.

Trump restoring order isn't change. Something has to change.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:05 AM

No, they SAY they are reacting against a fascist state. They ARE the fascists. Just like BLM isn't fighting against racism, they ARE racists. Black supremacists.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:17 AM

I don't know what you know about European history, and what fascism really is. But fascism started in Italy by Mussolini, and was later copied in Germany by Hitler. It started with political parties who had their own 'wrecking crew'. A group of people who intimidated and terrorized anyone who dared to get in their way. BLM/Antifa are EXACTLY that. A wrecking crew. They don't answer to the state, the law or anything. They just intimidate anyone with the 'wrong' views. The mainstream media is also just spewing leftist propaganda (again, media control and propaganda was a huge part of fascism).

Eventually they pave the way for the right (well wrong) people to come into power, and then the military and police can take over their place. Although not entirely. In the case of Nazi Germany, there always were the SS 'special forces', which grew out of the original 'wrecking crew'.

Trump isn't the fascist here, the Democrats and their BLM/Antifa helpers are.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:26 AM

On 7/18/2020 5:05 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:  
| Just like BLM isn't fighting against racism, they ARE racists. Black supremacists.

Okay, I'm definitely going to need a few citations for that claim. For goodness' sakes. I just googled for 5 minutes trying to find the common sources for that statement and all I got back was a few Fox News videos and some white supremacist sites. Are you a white supremacist?

My son marched in two BLM protests because he wants fair and equal treatment for black people. Does that make him a racist black supremacist?

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:51 AM

On 7/18/2020 5:17 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:  
| But fascism started in Italy by Mussolini, and was later copied in Germany by Hitler. It started with political parties who had their own 'wrecking crew'. A group of people who intimidated and terrorized anyone who dared to get in their way.

Right, like how many police departments have been acting towards black people for nearly a century.

| the state, the law or anything. They just intimidate anyone with the 'wrong' views. The mainstream media is also just spewing leftist propaganda (again, media control and propaganda was a huge part of fascism).

Okay, I understand the angle where suppression of free thought is wrong. If that's what you're thinking, okay, maybe you're scared and that's where your motivation in arguing is coming from. I get that. But until the USA marches into any country and demands the surrender of their leadership or the death of all white people, maybe you shouldn't worry about it so much.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:55 AM

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:26 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org> wrote:  
| On 7/18/2020 5:05 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:  
> Just like BLM isn't fighting against racism, they ARE racists. Black supremacists.

| Okay, I'm definitely going to need a few citations for that claim. For goodness' sakes. I just googled for 5 minutes trying to find the common sources for that statement and all I got back was a few Fox News videos and some white supremacist sites. Are you a white supremacist?

I'm not a white supremacist, I'm a humanist. I believe in Martin Luther King's idea of 'colourblindness'. To me, skin colour is just like hair colour or eye colour.

Here's an article from the Toronto Sun that indicates some rather disturbing anti-white statements from a BLM co-founder: <https://torontosun.com/2017/02/11/black-lives-matter-co-founder-appears-to-label-white-people-defects/wcm/2748a714-f567-4344-8c08-decfe73d1e52>

And you yourself equated BLM to the Black Panthers. They were black supremacists as well. As was Malcolm X, with his Nation of Islam (many prominent BLM'ers also appear to be muslim, may not be a coincidence, they may draw upon these earlier examples).

Obviously they're not TOO open about it (yet?), but here and there the black supremacy surfaces through the cracks. You can question the name alone: Black Lives Matter. And the fact that they take All Lives Matter as offensive (one woman was allegedly killed by BLM protestors for saying All Lives Matter: <https://www.the-sun.com/news/1137649/indiana-mom-all-black-lives-matter-shot-facebook/>).

That's not quite what you'd expect if you're anti-racism. They denounce Martin Luther King and his ideal of colourblindness.

And what do you think of the fact that they want white people to kneel for them, and wash their feet? At a protest in The Netherlands, they asked all white people to stand at the back.

These things just... don't feel right.

That whole book by Robin DiAngelo, "White Fragility", doesn't feel right. It is very anti-white. Basically white people can only be racists, no matter how you slice it. And they can't ever understand racism, so they can only listen to black people telling them what racism is (this puts black people in a position of power over white people).

Robin DiAngelo is seen as the guru of anti-racism.

Ben Shapiro did a good YouTube video on that book and all the crazy claims it makes: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iWgnX84KD7A>

In short, basically Robin DiAngelo 'inverts' white supremacy. She basically says it's in every white person, even if they don't know it. Then she uses that notion to frame everything in the world as white people being oppressors and black people being victims. It's actually very racist.

Also, did you hear about the black NFAC militia (okay, they claim they're not affiliated with BLM, but when push comes to shove, it's obvious whose side they'll take)? <https://www.newsweek.com/armed-black-demonstrators-challenge-white-supremacist-militia-georgias-stone-mountain-park-1515494>

This is not peaceful protesting anymore.

My son marched in two BLM protests because he wants fair and equal treatment for black people. Does that make him a racist black supremacist?

It doesn't.

If Black Lives Matter means "fair and equal treatment for black people", there's nothing wrong with that. And if it's just a peaceful march or protest, there's nothing wrong with that.

But therein lies the danger. The message is so simple, and impossible to fault, so easy to adopt.

But if there's an organization behind that, misusing this message for an entirely different agenda, then it gets suspicious. They can easily lure people into their camp, who aren't quite aware of what it is they are supporting.

In the UK, the BBC has already distanced themselves from BLM after some anti-Israel-tweets from the UK BLM account: <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/12008224/bbc-ban-blm-badge-group-accused-political/>

So there definitely is more to BLM than meets the eye, or to 'antiracism'.

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 1:20 AM

This guy generally has good content on these topics.

He's just posted a good video on what has been happening in Portland for years now: <https://youtu.be/CbF27qQZewM>

The videos he shows give you a good idea of why I say this is fascism. Just mobs of people who randomly block traffic and attack people, with apparently a communist/Marxist agenda to overthrow the government.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 4:22 AM

Sargon of Akkad is guilty of misrepresenting media as well, which has gotten him into trouble. I'll read your other sources.

On 7/18/2020 6:20 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

This guy generally has good content on these topics.

He's just posted a good video on what has been happening in Portland for years now:

<https://youtu.be/CbF27qQZewM>

The videos he shows give you a good idea of why I say this is fascism. Just mobs of people who randomly block traffic and attack people, with apparently a communist/Marxist agenda to overthrow the government.

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:51 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org <mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>> wrote:

On 7/18/2020 5:17 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

> But fascism started in Italy by Mussolini, and was later copied in Germany by

> Hitler. It started with political parties who had their own 'wrecking crew'. A

> group of people who intimidated and terrorized anyone who dared to get in > their way.

Right, like how many police departments have been acting towards black people for nearly a century.

> the state, the law or anything. They just intimidate anyone with the 'wrong'

> views. The mainstream media is also just spewing leftist propaganda

(again,  
> media control and propaganda was a huge part of fascism).

Okay, I understand the angle where suppression of free thought is wrong. If that's what you're thinking, okay, maybe you're scared and that's where your motivation in arguing is coming from. I get that. But until the USA marches into any country and demands the surrender of their leadership or the death of

all white people, maybe you shouldn't worry about it so much.

-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)

Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>

A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>

You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 5:10 AM

I read these. So, the problem I have is that these examples are extreme right-wing (Shapiro, Akkad). Akkad in particular is so far right that he's alt-right, and is simply a disgusting person regardless, so it's very hard to take these seriously. Just as you accuse far leftists of propaganda, far right-wing people do the same. There is no moderate coverage of this widespread fascist threat I can find, other than maybe the Sun article you posted -- where it says she was throwing around a racial slur before getting shot, which an upset black person might do having no affiliation with any movement at all. It doesn't make the killing justifiable, but it makes it understandable.

Also, the feeling I'm getting is that, other than Portland (which makes sense, being Portland), it is bad actors taking advantage of these movements to commit violence, or appropriating the movement's message for their own means. And there will always be crazy people who do that, it doesn't matter what the message is and on whose side it's on. There was some looting after a peaceful BLM protest in my own town, and when the police caught the guy, he turned out to be white and not affiliated with the movement at all, although because he had some racist posts on social media, is being accused of inciting violence to make the BLM protest look bad.

I'm not going to debate this with you any more. I don't subscribe to your view that there is some massive black uprising that threatens to turn the USA into a fascist regime. Regardless, even if it were true, I don't feel it can be changed until we have a government that stops dividing the nation and starts trying to unite it. My method of dealing with current world events is to vote new people into office.

It will be interesting to look back on this conversation in one year and see if your predictions came true or not.

On 7/18/2020 5:55 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:42 PM

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 5:10 AM Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)> wrote:

I read these. So, the problem I have is that these examples are extreme right-wing (Shapiro, Akkad). Akkad in particular is so far right that he's alt-right, and is simply a disgusting person regardless, so it's very hard to take these seriously.

And THAT is left-wing extremist thinking.

You are attacking the messenger, but it's about the message.

Aside from the fact that I have not heard anything remotely right-wing in either video, they are both citing their sources very clearly.

Akkad is mostly showing videos from Andy Ngo, who you can just find on Twitter as he did, to watch the videos directly.

And Shapiro makes a very good case against the White Fragility book. If you don't like him, you can find plenty of other sources that say the same.

One well-known article is this from Matt Taibbi: <https://taibbi.substack.com/p/on-white-fragility>

In general, the point is that the ideas from that book are intersectionalist thinking: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intersectionality>

They then boiled this down to a Critical race theory: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical\\_race\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_race_theory)



This is seen as a way to Social Justice: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_justice](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_justice) (again a term that sounds good on the surface, like Black Lives Matter, but if you look under the hood, it's different).

The way of thinking of these people is called 'Woke': <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Woke>

The political system of thinking in groups of race, gender etc is called Identity politics: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Identity\\_politics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Identity_politics)

Perhaps you can find sources you DO trust, based on these keywords and sources.

One other good source on BLM, from 2017, is this report by Michelle Malkin (perhaps you find an Asian woman less suspect than a white man): <https://youtu.be/7ljXduxquM>

Or you can check out Officer Tatum, a black former police officer, who is also critical of Black Lives Matter, the woke movement, and how democrats deal (or refuse to deal) with the situation: <https://www.youtube.com/user/btcruiser34>

I'm not going to debate this with you any more. I don't subscribe to your view that there is some massive black uprising that threatens to turn the USA into a fascist regime.

It's not blacks. Did you not look at the videos? The activists on the BLM/Antifa side are mostly white. They just THINK they are defending the black cause. That's the crazy thing about this whole woke movement. It's white people who think that the blacks are helpless, and the white people need to 'save' them. Which ironically only reinforces white supremacy.

Regardless, even if it were true, I don't feel it can be changed until we have a government that stops dividing the nation and starts trying to unite it. My method of dealing with current world events is to vote new people into office.

From where I'm standing, I don't see Trump actively dividing the nation. I do see BLM/Antifa actively dividing the nation (that's the whole thing about identity politics, you always have groups, and some are considered 'good', others are 'bad', or 'oppressor' and 'oppressed').

It will be interesting to look back on this conversation in one year and see if your predictions came true or not.

That is difficult to say. Because I can't judge whether democrats are just letting this happen because they think it increases their chances of winning the election, or if they actually want to succumb to the 'woke' demands of BLM/Antifa, and introduce identity politics (and eventually Marxism).

So there is a possibility that the democrats will stop the crazy activism as soon as they're in office, and continue with the USA as it was. But it's a gamble.

Even some Dutch politicians have already bought into the identity politics demands, and have proposed positively racist ideas. So chances are, the woke-virus is also in the majority of the democrat party. In which case you're screwed.

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:45 PM

Just saw this: <https://twitter.com/MarkDice/status/1284569764497485824>

A black woman who is saying "Refund the police", and is trying to paint over the BLM/Defund markings on the street. Apparently she doesn't agree with what BLM says. She says "We will never support Black Lives Matter".

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:47 PM

In the thread I also see this quote from Thomas Sowell (who as you know is black):

"Ours may become the first civilization destroyed, not by the power of our enemies, but by the ignorance of our teachers and the dangerous nonsense they are teaching our children. In an age of artificial intelligence, they are creating artificial stupidity." - Thomas Sowell

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 1:04 PM

This is also really good: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pHGt733yw3g>

Bret Weinstein, a former professor at Evergreen State College, who got 'cancelled' for his view that organizing a day where white students were not allowed on campus, was racist. He's one of the most outspoken people on the whole woke/identity politics/etc topics.

He has assembled a number of black thinkers, to discuss the situation. Well, just listen what intelligent black people think of the situation.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 6:09 PM

Please stop sending me these, as I can't do anything to change the situation.

On 7/19/2020 6:04 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

This is also really good: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pHGt733yw3g>

Bret Weinstein, a former professor at Evergreen State College, who got 'cancelled' for his view that organizing a day where white students were not allowed on campus, was racist. He's one of the most outspoken people on the whole woke/identity politics/etc topics.

He has assembled a number of black thinkers, to discuss the situation. Well, just listen what intelligent black people think of the situation.

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:47 PM Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org <mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>> wrote:

In the thread I also see this quote from Thomas Sowell (who as you know is black):

"Ours may become the first civilization destroyed, not by the power of our enemies, but by the ignorance of our teachers and the dangerous nonsense they are teaching our children. In an age of artificial intelligence, they are creating artificial stupidity." - Thomas Sowell

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:45 PM Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org <mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>> wrote:

Just saw this: <https://twitter.com/MarkDice/status/1284569764497485824>

A black woman who is saying "Refund the police", and is trying to paint over the BLM/Defund markings on the street. Apparently she doesn't agree with what BLM says. She says "We will never support Black Lives Matter".

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:42 PM Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org <mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>> wrote:

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 5:10 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 7:41 PM

Well, you get to vote in a few months. The least you can do is make sure you're properly informed. You can vote Democrat, Republican, or not vote at all.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 3:16 AM

If Trump is the nominee, I clearly can't vote for him. In fact, I think keeping him in office is dangerous, so my vote will go towards displacing him.

I usually never vote for what I want, but rather against what I know I don't want. Which is unfortunately the case in most elections here, because of the two-party system.

On 7/19/2020 12:41 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Well, you get to vote in a few months. The least you can do is make sure you're properly informed. You can vote Democrat, Republican, or not vote at all.

On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 6:09 PM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org <mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>> wrote:

Please stop sending me these, as I can't do anything to change the situation.

On 7/19/2020 6:04 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

> This is also really good: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pHGt733yw3g>  
> Bret Weinstein, a former professor at Evergreen State College, who got  
> 'cancelled' for his view that organizing a day where white students  
were not  
> allowed on campus, was racist. He's one of the most outspoken people on  
the

> whole woke/identity politics/etc topics.  
> He has assembled a number of black thinkers, to discuss the situation.

Well,

> just listen what intelligent black people think of the situation.

>

> On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:47 PM Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)  
<<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>

> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>> wrote:

>

> In the thread I also see this quote from Thomas Sowell (who as you  
know is

> black):

> "Ours may become the first civilization destroyed, not by the power  
of our

> enemies, but by the ignorance of our teachers and the dangerous  
nonsense

> they are teaching our children. In an age of artificial

intelligence, they

> are creating artificial stupidity." - Thomas Sowell

>

> On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:45 PM Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)  
<<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>

> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>> wrote:

>

> Just saw this:

<https://twitter.com/MarkDice/status/1284569764497485824>

> A black woman who is saying "Refund the police", and is trying to  
> paint over the BLM/Defund markings on the street. Apparently she  
> doesn't agree with what BLM says. She says "We will never support  
> Black Lives Matter".

>

> On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 12:42 PM Scali Bohemiq  
<[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org) <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>

> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org> <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>> wrote:

>

> On Sun, Jul 19, 2020 at 5:10 AM Jim Leonard

<[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>

> <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>

[Quoted text hidden]

-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)

Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>

A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>

You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>  
To: Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 1:52 PM

On Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 3:17 AM Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)> wrote:

If Trump is the nominee, I clearly can't vote for him. In fact, I think  
keeping him in office is dangerous, so my vote will go towards displacing him.

As they say, better the devil you know. So be sure you know what he will be replaced with.

At least with Trump you'll know he's not interested in the environment and foreign affairs, but he is interested in  
keeping the economy running, creating jobs, and defending free speech, the academy etc.

As someone said: "Trump is not the hero we want, but he is the hero we need".

I'll have to see in the coming months what kind of policies Joe Biden claims to be supporting, and what kind of issues  
he is openly denouncing. If it sounds too much like identity politics, he's out in my book, because although Trump may  
damage the country in some ways, at least he's not going to pull the foundation out from under it, and make it all go to  
hell.

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 3:04 PM

I think this article pretty much explains my stance:

<https://areomagazine.com/2020/07/18/im-a-nobody-the-harpers-letter-was-for-me/>

"I believe that black lives matter—but I cannot support Black Lives Matter when so much of their rhetoric is confused, dishonest or based on misinterpretations of the data. I reject and repudiate racism of any kind, but I can't in good conscience support the current strains of anti-racism because so many of their tenets and arguments are nonsensical, tautological, and even racist in themselves. I love, respect, and feel deep compassion for trans people and do not deny anyone's fundamental humanity or right to exist, but I cannot deny my own understanding of the science behind biological sex.

None of these perspectives come from a place of hatred or ignorance—quite the opposite. I care deeply about solving the issue of police violence, about eliminating racism and hatred wherever they exist, about achieving a truly egalitarian society in which all are free to live as they wish. It is precisely because I care about these problems that I am so staunchly committed to practicality and honesty in engaging with them. We cannot solve them if we deny objective reality, and we cannot achieve our goal of building a better world for everyone if we can't communicate effectively—especially when we disagree.

The trouble is that even saying this is dangerous. I have a great job and feel valuable at work for the first time in my life. What a terrible thing it would be to lose this opportunity over a tweet or article that has been misinterpreted by strangers on the internet. It's perfectly understandable for me—and for many like me—to feel that the risk isn't worth it and remain silent. But this dynamic is unsustainable and, despite my instinct for self preservation, I find myself compelled to speak, however tentatively, to try to contribute to the discourse in a meaningful and productive way. It bothers me when people don't seem to make any sense. It breaks my heart when I see us veering further and further off the path to progress because we can't—or won't—communicate. I speak despite being terrified about the possible repercussions because how can we build a better world if we don't encourage good-faith discourse?"

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 6:33 PM

Okay, that's a very concise description. It's worded well, and I understand your concerns.

So that you understand my viewpoint, I'll respond inline below:

On 7/20/2020 8:04 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

"I believe that black lives matter—but I cannot support Black Lives Matter when so much of their rhetoric is confused, dishonest or based on misinterpretations of the data. I reject and repudiate racism of any kind, but I can't in good conscience support the current strains of anti-racism because so many of their tenets and arguments are nonsensical, tautological, and even racist in themselves. I love, respect, and feel deep compassion for trans people and do not deny anyone's fundamental humanity or right to exist, but I cannot deny my own understanding of the science behind biological sex.

My response: We shouldn't fail to implement social change that is desperately needed just because we disagree on the details. Deadlocking the "correct" way to do this, while humiliating and deadly injustices continue to be committed, is deeply troubling to me. These are matters of basic human dignity.

> racist in themselves. I love, respect, and feel deep compassion for trans  
> people and do not deny anyone's fundamental humanity or right to exist, but > I cannot deny my own understanding of the science behind biological sex.

This doesn't make sense to me. I don't know what that is referring to, and it also seems out of place in that response. It also reads like someone who doesn't understand that biological sex and gender are different things, ie. sex is your assigned genitalia, while gender is your sexual identity and public presentation. (Example: A trans man who has not had reassignment surgery still has female genitalia. Their gender presentation is male, and they should be referred to as male, even though their sex is female.) Maybe this isn't fully understood by some people?

None of these perspectives come from a place of hatred or ignorance—quite the opposite. I care deeply about solving the issue of police violence, about eliminating racism and hatred wherever they exist, about achieving a truly egalitarian society in which all are free to live as they wish. It is precisely because I care about these problems that I am so staunchly committed to practicality and honesty in engaging with them. We cannot solve them if we deny objective reality, and we cannot achieve our goal of building a better world for everyone if we can't communicate effectively—especially when we disagree.

The problem I have with this is that some of these basic issues have been debated for decades. There will never be consensus, and while the debate continues, people continue to be oppressed, and sometimes killed. Action needs to

be taken \*now\*, any action at all -- and then, after at least \*some\* action has been taken, we can resume the arguments and debates.

The trouble is that even saying this is dangerous. I have a great job and feel valuable at work for the first time in my life. What a terrible thing it would be to lose this opportunity over a tweet or article that has been misinterpreted by strangers on the internet. It's perfectly understandable for me—and for many like me—to feel that the risk isn't worth it and remain silent. But this dynamic is unsustainable and, despite my instinct for self preservation, I find myself compelled to speak, however tentatively, to try to contribute to the discourse in a meaningful and productive way. It bothers me when people don't seem to make any sense. It breaks my heart when I see us veering further and further off the path to progress because we can't—or won't—communicate. I speak despite being terrified about the possible repercussions because how can we build a better world if we don't encourage good-faith discourse?"

This shows a fundamental lack of perspective, in my opinion. This person is afraid of speaking up for fear of retribution, but is oblivious to the fact that that's what the other side (blacks, trans people, women pressured into sex, etc.) have already experienced for a long time.

When I read that original Harper's letter, it read to me as people who finally experienced what being "shut down" by an oppressive system felt like, and were whining that it wasn't fair. While they should have used that opportunity to recognize "Oh, so that's what the other side feels like", they just chose to complain from high positions of power and wealth. They were arguing for informed rational discourse, when the other side hasn't been given that opportunity. It seemed very elitist, like "these rules shouldn't apply to us".

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 7:42 PM

My response: We shouldn't fail to implement social change that is desperately needed just because we disagree on the details. Deadlocking the "correct" way to do this, while humiliating and deadly injustices continue to be committed, is deeply troubling to me. These are matters of basic human dignity.

I disagree.

This is not about 'details' but about fundamental choices in what kind of changes you want to implement.

For example, you can say "fight racism", but it is fundamentally different whether you want to go for equal opportunity, or for equal outcome.

I fully support the former. I think the latter is a total disaster. It will lead to situations like "There are X% black people in society, so your company needs to hire X% black people".

That in itself is discriminatory. Aside from that, it also leads to problems. You HAVE to hire a certain quota of people of a particular race. Which means that if supply isn't that big (and currently, at least in the software world, it is close to non-existent), you pretty much end up hiring the first black person that comes along.

Not only is that person likely to be unqualified for the task, everyone in the company will know it.

I've heard the same from women when feminists wanted quotas for more 'diversity'. Women themselves didn't want to work at such a company, because they would never know whether they were hired for their skills, or for their gender. So I wouldn't be surprised if qualified black people felt the same about it.

As I already touched upon, I think the real 'problem' is the lack of supply. I say 'problem' with quotes, because I don't see the lack of supply of black people in software as a problem in itself. The same goes for women. It's just a fact of life that for some reason, hardly any woman seems to be interested in software engineering. In my class of 190 students at university, there were about 5 women. There are no barriers to entry for these women. They just don't seem interested.

Now, if black people DO want to get into software, but for some reason they are prevented to do so, then there is your REAL problem, and that needs to be solved.

I think this is actually where the problem is, because the black community is generally poorer, and goes to public schools that aren't that good. Their parents are generally also not educated that well, so they will receive less support with their education from home.

I think therein lies a possible solution: these schools need to be improved, and the students that can and want to learn, need to get proper guidance so they can achieve the goals that they have the potential to achieve.

I think it may take generations to really catch up here, but in general we should strive for every generation doing better than their parents, across the board.

Then the rest will solve itself eventually. More black people will get a high school diploma with good grades, they will have access to more universities, and they will do better at these universities, because they know what to expect. There's an interesting thing known as 'first-generation college student', which has nothing to do with race. It's just the general observation that it's much more difficult to get through college if nobody in your immediate family has any experience with it, and can't give you any guidance. I know this first-hand, because I'm first-generation as well, and struggled a lot in my first years. Which also shows that the whole 'white privilege' thing is nonsense, and far more



intricate social constructs are at play. It's an experience similar to being in a foreign country, where you don't know the language, you don't know the customs, you don't know where to find any locations etc. If you have a guide, it's much easier all of a sudden.

I think a lot of black people lack a 'guide' that helps them to grasp opportunities that are available to them.

This doesn't make sense to me. I don't know what that is referring to, and it also seems out of place in that response. It also reads like someone who doesn't understand that biological sex and gender are different things, ie. sex is your assigned genitalia, while gender is your sexual identity and public presentation. (Example: A trans man who has not had reassignment surgery still has female genitalia. Their gender presentation is male, and they should be referred to as male, even though their sex is female.) Maybe this isn't fully understood by some people?

I think you need to back up a step.

Biological sex was the ONLY distinction that we made, for centuries.

Now some people are rewriting those rules. You can say anyone who opposes those rules "doesn't fully understand them". But changing those rules makes a HUGE impact on pretty much everything in society. So you better make sure that you make the right changes.

I get the feeling that people want to change the rules just because "they feel like it".

I don't believe in mixing feelings with fundamental changes to society like this. The rules should be made from rational thought, and be logically sound.

Having said that, the whole gender/trans thing is not that important to me, I don't really have an opinion on it. The thing that bothers me is the video I showed earlier, when that person said that using the wrong word is an "act of violence".

Namely, to me (and I think that is the key to free Western civilizations everywhere), your freedom ends where another person's freedom starts.

And they consistently break that rule. They demand that \*I\* give up my freedom to use my language in a way that I'm comfortable with, because \*they\* claim they are hurt/offended/whatever. That's just not how it works. You don't have a right not to be offended. Words aren't an "act of violence". That's just nonsense. The basis of our society is that we assume everyone is well-meaning, and wants to maintain a certain level of decency and respect.

And that alone should be enough for me to address you in the way you want to be addressed, if you ask me to (I can't know beforehand, can I? Like with the example of my 'car' that identifies as a 'bicycle').

When someone goes off on a rant about "words are an act of violence", they break the rules of free speech. They get emotional, and think their emotions justify that my freedom is impaired. That's just not how it works, period. That may sound harsh, but that's how it is. As I say, the way to get people to address you the way you want, is through decency and respect. Not by going on an emotional rant and pushing demands.

And that is how I see the gay community as totally different. My experience with the gay community is that they basically completely play the game 'by the rules'. Which makes it very easy to get along together, and is probably the reason why their acceptance has grown tremendously over the years.

Martin Luther King also played the game 'by the rules', by doing only peaceful protests, and respecting white people, in the face of everything. This caused white people to actually listen to what he said, and actually respect him as a person.

I think the rules of the game are okay, and they work fine. We shouldn't change them.

Once you move away from rationality and objectivity and replace it with emotion and vaguely determined language, you are on your way to fascism/communism.

The problem I have with this is that some of these basic issues have been debated for decades. There will never be consensus, and while the debate continues, people continue to be oppressed, and sometimes killed. Action needs to be taken \*now\*, any action at all -- and then, after at least \*some\* action has been taken, we can resume the arguments and debates.

No, certainly NOT any action at all, see above.

This shows a fundamental lack of perspective, in my opinion. This person is afraid of speaking up for fear of retribution, but is oblivious to the fact that that's what the other side (blacks, trans people, women pressured into sex, etc.) have already experienced for a long time.

I'm not sure if that's even true at all.

I grew up watching Oprah. Pretty sure she was the most powerful woman in the US, and could say whatever the hell she wanted to say. Pretty sure she's black too.

Anyway, it doesn't matter. It's just wrong if you can't speak up, period. Even if what you say is true, and even if he is oblivious to it, it doesn't change anything.

When I read that original Harper's letter, it read to me as people who finally experienced what being "shut down" by an oppressive system felt like, and were whining that it wasn't fair. While they should have used that opportunity to recognize "Oh, so that's what the other side feels like", they just chose to complain from high positions of power and wealth. They were arguing for informed rational discourse, when the other side hasn't been given that opportunity. It seemed very elitist, like "these rules shouldn't apply to us".

That's not how I interpreted it.

As I say, I feel like people are losing rationality and are going emotional on us.

Especially if you read some of the antiracism stuff, it's totally bonkers. We touched on 'decolonizing science' earlier. Basically they make outrageous claims that rationality and laws etc are all part of a system of white supremacy, and all need to be abandoned.

Also, as mentioned, they think in identity politics. Who you are (white, black, straight, gay, trans, male, female, whatever) determines the rate of 'oppression' you suffer, and thereby the amount of 'right' you have to talk about things. Basically a white straight male is totally screwed, because no matter what you do, you're always racist and always the oppressor.

So they want to shut us down completely. Which in effect means we CAN'T help them solve their issues. Which is somewhat ironic, because as crackpot as these people are, the one thing they do have straight is that most people in the position of power to make a change are straight white males.

Again, we can't let go of our system of rationality and structure, just because they think it's a 'system of white oppression'. Once we do that, we'll end up in a fascist/communist totalitarian dictatorship in no time. After all, once you no longer need to make rational decisions about whether something is actually racism, sexism or whatever, but only a person claiming they FEEL that it is racism/sexism/whatever oppression, anything goes. Exactly as it did with fascism in the years that led up to WWII, and with communism with endless 'cleansings' of whichever groups of people were 'wrong' this time. They didn't need an actual reason anymore to just dispose anyone who was in their way.

So this is where I draw a hard line. The rules of the game have worked for centuries. Propose changes, but play by the rules. Currently, most proposed changes are horribly misguided. As I said, defunding the police is suicide. The whole point of the police is that they are the only ones with the right to use force. Which means they are ALWAYS the strongest party. This prevents anarchy.

Once you get to a point where other parties can become the strongest, they will take over, because you will always get into anarchy, and then the strongest will rule. We've seen that in CHAZ/CHOP, and it wasn't pretty. Lots of violence, rape, killings etc.

People simply aren't responsible enough to keep law and order, especially not those BLM/Antifa nutjobs. That's why we need a trained police force. Like I said above with the school system, perhaps the police system needs to be reviewed and procedures need to be changed. But not defunding, never.

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 9:19 PM

On 7/20/2020 12:42 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

I disagree.

This is not about 'details' but about fundamental choices in what kind of changes you want to implement. For example, you can say "fight racism", but it is fundamentally different whether you want to go for equal opportunity, or for equal outcome.

I understand that because I am against affirmative action. But at the same time, I am \*more\* against people trying to maintain the status quo.

As I already touched upon, I think the real 'problem' is the lack of supply. I say 'problem' with quotes, because I don't see the lack of supply of black people in software as a problem in itself. The same goes for women. It's just a fact of life that for some reason, hardly any woman seems to be interested in software engineering. In my class of 190 students at university, there were about 5 women. There are no barriers to entry for these women. They just don't seem interested.

There are women who have spoken out that they were steered away from math and sciences by mentors who felt women should stay in traditional roles.

I think this is actually where the problem is, because the black community is generally poorer, and goes to public schools that aren't that good. Their parents are generally also not educated that well, so they will receive less support with their education from home.

I think therein lies a possible solution: these schools need to be improved, and the students that can and want to

learn, need to get proper guidance so they can achieve the goals that they have the potential to achieve. I think it may take generations to really catch up here, but in general we should strive for every generation doing better than their parents, across the board.

I agree completely, but some people can't wait generations for change.

Then the rest will solve itself eventually. More black people will get a high school diploma with good grades, they will have access to more universities, and they will do better at these universities, because they know what to expect.

There's an interesting thing known as 'first-generation college student', which has nothing to do with race. It's just the general observation that it's much more difficult to get through college if nobody in your immediate family has any experience with it, and can't give you any guidance. I know this first-hand, because I'm first-generation as well, and struggled a lot in my first years. Which also shows that the whole 'white privilege' thing is nonsense, and far more intricate social constructs are at play. It's an experience similar to being in a foreign country, where you don't know the language, you don't know the customs, you don't know where to find any locations etc. If you have a guide, it's much easier all of a sudden.

I disagree white privilege is nonsense. Decades of social norms prioritizing a caucasian experience certainly affords white people some inherent privileges.

I think a lot of black people lack a 'guide' that helps them to grasp opportunities that are available to them.

This may be true.

I think you need to back up a step.

Biological sex was the ONLY distinction that we made, for centuries.

Now some people are rewriting those rules. You can say anyone who opposes those rules "doesn't fully understand them". But changing those rules makes a HUGE impact on pretty much everything in society. So you better make sure that you make the right changes.

I get the feeling that people want to change the rules just because "they feel like it".

I don't believe in mixing feelings with fundamental changes to society like this. The rules should be made from rational thought, and be logically sound.

Society changes \*because\* of feelings.

I think it is a natural change that occurs over time. People get mad that new "incorrect" words get added to english dictionaries, for example "ain't" in the 1930s, and "Doh!" was famously added to the Oxford in 2001. But people fail to realize that dictionaries represent the current state, not the correct state.

Having said that, the whole gender/trans thing is not that important to me, I don't really have an opinion on it. The thing that bothers me is the video I showed earlier, when that person said that using the wrong word is an "act of violence".

It's an act of disrespect. "Violence" might be how it feels to them.

And they consistently break that rule. They demand that \*I\* give up my freedom to use my language in a way that I'm comfortable with, because \*they\* claim they are hurt/offended/whatever. That's just not how it works. You don't have a right not to be offended. Words aren't an "act of violence". That's just nonsense. The basis of our society is that we assume everyone is well-meaning, and wants to maintain a certain level of decency and respect.

And that alone should be enough for me to address you in the way you want to be addressed, if you ask me to (I can't know beforehand, can I? Like with the example of my 'car' that identifies as a 'bicycle').

When someone goes off on a rant about "words are an act of violence", they break the rules of free speech. They get emotional, and think their emotions justify that my freedom is impaired. That's just not how it works, period. That may sound harsh, but that's how it is. As I say, the way to get people to address you the way you want, is through decency and respect. Not by going on an emotional rant and pushing demands.

Well, I don't agree it is violence, and I don't agree there should be 174 genders. But I do think there should be more than two, and I think that people have the right to be addressed in the way they want to be addressed, as long they make it known beforehand how they want to be addressed. I think the "violence" part comes when someone has been informed how a person wants to be addressed and that someone continually insists on using different terms. That can definitely be viewed as an aggressive act. Like, if you called me "James", and I told you I preferred to be called "Jim", but you kept calling me James in disregard for my wishes, or even as an intentional show of disrespect. So I think that's where the violence comment is coming from.

One argument I've seen against multiple genders is that it would be difficult to remember what each people wants to be called. I just look at a custom gender as someone's middle or last name, which I certainly have no trouble remembering.

As I say, I feel like people are losing rationality and are going emotional on us.

Not all. But for some, their patience has been eroded to points past logical discourse.

Also, as mentioned, they think in identity politics. Who you are (white, black, straight, gay, trans, male, female, whatever) determines the rate of 'oppression' you suffer, and thereby the amount of 'right' you have to talk about things.

There is a degree of truth to this. It is hypocritical of me, for example, to denounce gay rights because I am not gay, haven't lived as gay, etc.

So they want to shut us down completely. Which in effect means we CAN'T help them solve their issues. Which is somewhat ironic, because as crackpot as these people are, the one thing they do have straight is that most people in the position of power to make a change are straight white males.

As unfair as it is, I don't think they want to shut us down completely, but rather only shut down the people who are hurting their cause. I'm sure they wouldn't shut down someone in favor of trans rights.

Again, we can't let go of our system of rationality and structure, just because they think it's a 'system of white oppression'. Once we do that, we'll end up in a fascist/communist totalitarian dictatorship in no time. After all, once you no longer need to make rational decisions about whether something is actually racism, sexism or whatever, but only a person claiming they FEEL that it is racism/sexism/whatever oppression, anything goes. Exactly as it did with fascism in the years that led up to WWII, and with communism with endless 'cleansings' of whichever groups of people were 'wrong' this time. They didn't need an actual reason anymore to just dispose anyone who was in their way.

So this is where I draw a hard line. The rules of the game have worked for centuries. Propose changes, but play by the rules. Currently, most proposed changes are horribly misguided. As I said, defunding the police is suicide. The whole point of the police is that they are the only ones with the right to use force. Which means they are ALWAYS the strongest party. This prevents anarchy.

Once you get to a point where other parties can become the strongest, they will take over, because you will always get into anarchy, and then the strongest will rule. We've seen that in CHAZ/CHOP, and it wasn't pretty. Lots of violence, rape, killings etc.

People simply aren't responsible enough to keep law and order, especially not those BLM/Antifa nutjobs. That's why we need a trained police force. Like I said above with the school system, perhaps the police system needs to be reviewed and procedures need to be changed. But not defunding, never.

Well, call me an anarchist, I guess, even though I don't identify as anarchist (or socialist, or leftist, or conservative). I have a wide mixture of views from all parties. I guess that makes me moderate, in favor of social democracy? An endangered species in the USA right now.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Mon, Jul 20, 2020 at 11:44 PM

I understand that because I am against affirmative action. But at the same time, I am \*more\* against people trying to maintain the status quo.

Yes, I'm also against people trying to maintain the status quo. But who are these people?

In my view, it would actually be the anti-racism activists. Because I described where I think the problems are, and these aren't the areas they are addressing.

Of course if there are people who don't want to improve the situation AT ALL, that would be bad as well, but I'm not sure if there are many people like that. I'm pretty sure an overwhelming majority wants to help the people who are struggling to get better chances in life.

There are women who have spoken out that they were steered away from math and sciences by mentors who felt women should stay in traditional roles.

I guess that problem is two-fold. Those mentors have the right to have an opinion, and to express it, but I'm not sure how anyone could have such an old-fashioned opinion, and why they'd want to express that opinion in their position. At the same time, we get back to own responsibility. These women have absolutely zero obligation to do what their mentor tells them. There's nothing keeping them from making their own choices.

And I think to some extent (perhaps even a big extent) the same goes for black people. If they make better choices in life, they can get further. Which brings me back to the 'guide' I mentioned before (but that shouldn't go for white women at least, because they would grow up in the same families as white men, where the family itself generally is their guide).

I agree completely, but some people can't wait generations for change.

Yea, I don't want to wait any longer for quantum computing either. But I can't just storm Intel's HQ and demand that they give me quantum computers, because I want them. Life just doesn't work that way.

We can't rush to poorly thought out solutions just because some people lack the patience required for a proper structural solution.

I disagree white privilege is nonsense. Decades of social norms prioritizing a caucasian experience certainly affords white people some inherent privileges.

Not sure what a "caucasian experience" is.

But I think this is pretty interesting. Look at this chart of 'Whiteness', published by the National Museum of African American History and Culture a few days ago:

[https://twitter.com/ByronYork/status/1283372233730203651?ref\\_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1283372233730203651%7Ctwgr%5E&ref\\_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.insider.com%2Fafican-american-museum-in-dc-apologizes-for-whiteness-chart-2020-7](https://twitter.com/ByronYork/status/1283372233730203651?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1283372233730203651%7Ctwgr%5E&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.insider.com%2Fafican-american-museum-in-dc-apologizes-for-whiteness-chart-2020-7)

They have since withdrawn the chart, but that doesn't change the fact that some people actually think this way, and actually thought it was okay to create a chart like this, and publish it.

Now, the obvious problem here is: They attribute it all to race.

That's fullblown racism right there. That chart basically says "white supremacy".

Ben Shapiro (know you don't like the guy, but hey) did a video on that, where he criticizes this chart and says that David Duke (leader of KKK) could literally have said all of this: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ehAFIKu-DcU>

See, what the chart describes is basically Western-European culture, which is the basis of the United States of America, among many other countries.

It is in no way tied to any specific race. Sure, most Western-Europeans were white. Nevertheless, the same values can and have been adopted by people of colour just as easily. Basically these are the 'rules of the game', and if you stick to them, you will play the game well, and you should be able to build up a successful and happy life, within your personal talents and limitations.

Which also means that I don't think white people have any inherent privileges. The main privilege they have is that their parents already know how to play the game, so they can teach you. But an excellent example is white parents who adopted children of colour. They raise them as if they were white kids (obviously), so these children understand how to play the game, and are generally every bit as successful as white kids.

Asians also know how to 'play the game', because their culture is very similar in many ways. Asians mainly have more trouble being successful in politics, because that's where they differ. But they do great in school and in business.

But by tying this to a skin colour, it basically says: "If you're white, you can do this (and only this), and if you're black, you can't".

In fact, many black activists may actually see this as: "This is the system of white supremacy, and we must tear ALL OF THIS down in order to stop it, and give blacks a chance."

And this line of thinking is what you're seeing right now. Black people denouncing science, rationality, critical thinking, logic, rules etc, because they're part of "institutional racism/white supremacy".

I don't think they know what they're doing.

Society changes \*because\* of feelings.

Yes, and that's fine. But we can't make legislation based on feelings.

We can use the feelings to get an indication of where legislation needs to change (eg gay marriage, abortion, euthanasia), but then we have to move very carefully to make sure the new legislation does what it was intended to do.

It's an act of disrespect. "Violence" might be how it feels to them.

Yea, but imagine if we let these people make up legislation. They can't separate their feelings from coherent thought and objective reasoning.

Well, I don't agree it is violence, and I don't agree there should be 174 genders. But I do think there should be more than two, and I think that people have the right to be addressed in the way they want to be addressed, as long they make it known beforehand how they want to be addressed.

But there you go, you say the same as I do, I suppose.

We need to make sure we define this situation properly, before we act on it. Some people want 174 genders, and if we have their way, that's what legislation will look like, and we'll have to play along, or get fined or whatever for breaking the law.

My stance on fighting racism is the same: Define the situation properly, don't just give in to every whim.



I think the "violence" part comes when someone has been informed how a person wants to be addressed and that someone continually insists on using different terms. That can definitely be viewed as an aggressive act. Like, if you called me "James", and I told you I preferred to be called "Jim", but you kept calling me James in disregard for my wishes, or even as an intentional show of disrespect. So I think that's where the violence comment is coming from.

I know where it's coming from, I just think it's an overreaction, and certainly not something that could work in practice. Because if they equate words to violence, that implies that they think it's okay to fight violence with violence. And that's what I'm seeing from BLM/Antifa in Portland, for example. They think they have the right to destroy property and try to set the federal court on fire. Because in their eyes, it's evil, and institutional racism and whatever. We simply cannot tolerate that. These people need to be set straight.

Not all. But for some, their patience has been eroded to points past logical discourse.

I think for a lot of these activists, logical discourse was never an option in the first place. They simply lack the capacity.

There is a degree of truth to this. It is hypocritical of me, for example, to denounce gay rights because I am not gay, haven't lived as gay, etc.

No, I don't think there's any truth in this at all. This is their way of 'intersectional' thinking. Everyone is part of a collection of 'groups' (male, gay, white, etc), where every group has a certain level of 'oppression'. So they create subgroups for people, where the subgroup's oppression level is the sum of the groups you're part of, if that makes sense.

That logic is flawed. Because if you take this to the logical endpoint, there are infinitely many subgroups, and in the end you end up with individuals. Which is what society is already based on.

Except, society does NOT attach any kind of 'oppression level' to an individual.

But that doesn't work in their Marxist world view. Marxism needs the tension between oppressors and oppressed. That's why they're artificially creating as much tension as possible. It's like a communist revolution (which is very similar to a fascist revolution).

As unfair as it is, I don't think they want to shut us down completely, but rather only shut down the people who are hurting their cause. I'm sure they wouldn't shut down someone in favor of trans rights.

But, let's get back to what I said about them denouncing rationalism and logic in favour of emotion.

These people are not capable of properly judging who is hurting their cause and who is not.

There are already plenty of examples of people who have been 'cancelled' for completely bogus reasons.

Here's an article that highlights a few: <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2020/07/cancel-culture-and-problem-woke-capitalism/614086/>

There's the danger. This movement is not rational. There is no rational way of ensuring you're 'safe', and working for 'their cause'.

That is EXACTLY what happened in Russia and China in their communist revolutions. Millions of people were deported or killed, without any kind of trial. Just because someone 'thought' they were 'wrong', for whatever reason. As I already said, it doesn't matter who's right or wrong anymore.

Well, call me an anarchist, I guess, even though I don't identify as anarchist (or socialist, or leftist, or conservative). I have a wide mixture of views from all parties. I guess that makes me moderate, in favor of social democracy? An endangered species in the USA right now.

I also don't particularly subscribe to one political direction. I also think a social democracy is the ideal. Capitalism with enough of the rough edges filed off so that everyone can be happy and successful.

I have a few thoughts on the left and right though.

The left wants the state to control things as much as possible, to help the weak. On the one hand that is noble, but on the other hand the problem is that the state is basically the 'supremacy' and civilians are merely 'victims', at the mercy of the state. It does not inspire individual responsibility. I get this especially from most black people (who seem to mostly vote democrat). They seem to think 'the system' is keeping them down, so the only solution is that 'the system' needs to change. They can't do anything about it themselves. Some people say that these black people are on the 'democrat plantation', and this is actually the democrats who keep the blacks enslaved and powerless this way (which is an interesting point, given that the democrats were pro-slavery in the civil war).

Left-wing politics is centered mostly about feelings and emotions, and seems to especially attract people that aren't very good at exact science. Some say that left-wing/socialist thinking is for immature thinkers.

I suppose there is some truth to that. Socialism is an interesting ideal, but it is also somewhat naive to think that everyone can be equally rich, happy, successful or whatnot.

Right-wing people are very rational, which may appear emotionless. But they are much more open to facts, science, logic etc than left-wing people. Right-wing people are generally open to discuss things, even if they don't agree. Left-wing people prefer to just shut down a conversation altogether if they don't agree (which again points to immaturity). Left-wing people just take the moral high ground, and are generally disrespectful of people who don't share their opinion, because they have a perceived moral superiority. On twitter it's quite extreme, where they'll quickly insult someone as racist, fascist, nazi, extreme-right and whatnot, without ever bothering to discuss the actual topic.

So where does that leave me? I grew up in a very socialist society, far more socialist than the US. So I suppose I am naturally socialist/left-wing biased. At the same time, I'm a software-engineer with a university education. So I'm a very rational and logical thinker. This means that I may not necessarily share right-wing ideas, but I do share their approach of open debate, and basing decisions on facts, logic and rationale.

So that's why I want to discuss things like racism with BLM. But their supporters are extreme left-wing, and they will immediately label me as extreme-right or alt-right, racist, fascist, nazi etc, simply for the fact that I want to find out the facts, before I am willing to subscribe to their ideology. By this time I've found out enough of their underlying ideology that I know it's dangerous nonsense, and I will never subscribe to that. Yet I still want to fight racism. I just want to find better ways than what they are suggesting.

See, we can agree on a lot of things, if we just keep communicating.

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Tue, Jul 21, 2020 at 10:46 AM

By the way, I'm not sure if you are aware of the history of the Nazi party. Nazi is short for 'Nationalsozialismus', the German name for National Socialism, their political direction. The full name of the party is NSDAP: Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei, or in English: National Socialist German Workers' Party

So they actually identify as socialists. They actively denounced capitalism. They also denounced communism, although they did say that if push comes to shove, they'd rather choose Bolshevism (the Russian model of communism/Marxism) over capitalism.

Which is an interesting thing. Because generally people associate right-wing with capitalism and liberalism, basically "every man for himself", and as little state-interference as possible.

The Nazi's weren't like that. They were socialist and the state interfered a lot. They had a sort of controlled capitalism system, which was aimed at strengthening the military.

It seems that the only thing that they have in common with what we currently view as 'right-wing' is their extreme nationalism and hatred towards people of other races and cultures.

And that's why I say the current BLM/Antifa things are so close to fascism.

Some people put forward the horseshoe-theory: if you go left three times, you end up right. It seems that this is what happened with BLM/Antifa. They are so extremely on the left, that they moved over into fascist/Nazi territory, including the pushing of a racial ideology, in their case based on identity politics and Critical Race Theory, bearing remarkable resemblance to the racial ideology based on 'Aryans' vs 'Jews' that the Nazis had.

So in short, Nazis and communists are actually close cousins.

I am surprised that Marxism is so popular in the US these days. Probably because they have never seen it up close.

I've been to parts of Europe that were communist. It wasn't pretty. There are also many movies on the subject (a lot of them German). Which are probably never shown in the US.

A very nice one is Das Leben Der Anderen: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0405094/>

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Tue, Jul 21, 2020 at 12:30 PM

Ah, this piece also has a very interesting passage that expresses some of my ideas very clearly:

<https://forward.com/opinion/451099/a-new-intelligentsia-is-pushing-back-against-wokeness/>

"There is a cost to a false positive, in other words, to identifying something as racist when it's not. And that cost is not just felt in the solutions it obfuscates, but on a personal level. The way Foster explained it, if he has a negative interaction with someone that is rooted in racism but he chooses to see it as non-racial, he's lost nothing. But if he has a negative interaction that wasn't racist and he imposes a racial filter on it, he has lost a piece of his humanity."

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Tue, Jul 21, 2020 at 5:45 PM

I can't reply, I'm exhausted. I'd really like to table this discussion for a later date when I have less family, work, mental things to take care of. But some final notes from me:

- We want the same goals but differ on how to achieve them, and I don't think that will be bridged any time soon

- "attacking the messenger instead of the message" -- my rebuttal is "if the messenger is suspect, their messages are suspect". If the message is so important, the right/conservative/whatever should try to find less distasteful messengers.

On 7/21/2020 5:30 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Ah, this piece also has a very interesting passage that expresses some of my ideas very clearly:

<https://forward.com/opinion/451099/a-new-intelligentsia-is-pushing-back-against-wokeness/>

"There is a cost to a false positive, in other words, to identifying something as racist when it's not. And that cost is not just felt in the solutions it obfuscates, but on a personal level. The way Foster explained it, if he has a negative interaction with someone that is rooted in racism but he chooses to see it as non-racial, he's lost nothing. But if he has a negative interaction that wasn't racist and he imposes a racial filter on it, he has lost a piece of his humanity."

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Wed, Jul 22, 2020 at 7:39 PM

- We want the same goals but differ on how to achieve them, and I don't think that will be bridged any time soon

That's already a lot better than you thinking I have different goals. You even asked me if I was a white supremacist. For me there's no reason why we'd ever have to agree on how to achieve things. As long as you know for yourself that you've considered enough options to believe in the path you choose.

- "attacking the messenger instead of the message" -- my rebuttal is "if the messenger is suspect, their messages are suspect". If the message is so important, the right/conservative/whatever should try to find less distasteful messengers.

This is an interesting one.

The spindoctors obviously know this as well. Which is exactly why they will frame anyone who sends a message that they don't like, to make sure that people will find the messenger distasteful, no matter whether there's any truth to it or not.

Effectively that means that as long as the spindoctors do their job properly, you'll never find anyone that spreads a message they don't like, where they didn't try to frame them as distasteful.

Which is why I've long tried to filter through what image people may or may not allegedly have, and just listen to their message, and try to reconstruct that same message from the sources they point to. If I can reconstruct enough of their message from the sources I can find myself, I can trust the message.

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 8:42 PM

Some weeks have passed, things happened.

This article sums up more or less what I said earlier: <https://andrewsullivan.substack.com/p/the-trap-the-democrats-walked-right>

Basically the Democrats made a pact with the devil (BLM/Antifa) and are now paralyzed: they are unwilling or unable to condemn the violence (in some cases actually supporting it, by mayors instructing police not to take action), and it is has got too far out of hand. Law and order have slipped out of their hands.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 9:42 PM

I think actual fascism is the bigger story: Trump admitting on record that he intended to cripple the US postal service so that he could try to steal the election by preventing mail-in ballots. Because of covid, the amount of mailed ballots will be at its highest record ever. I think voter suppression is a more fascist threat than localized demonstrations.

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/aug/13/donald-trump-usps-post-office-election-funding> has one summary.

Contrary to what you might watch, I can tell you that the USA has not devolved into utter anarchy and chaos. Some demonstrations are peaceful, some are not, some have violence committed by people later found to be white racist instigators. It's a mix. About one day a month I have restricted travel into downtown Chicago, otherwise it's fine. It's way less important than the bigger picture of voting Trump's organization out of office. Once that's done, we can then address the issue of why inner-city blacks in the USA are in a poverty cycle they have trouble breaking out of and what we can do about it.

On 8/28/2020 1:42 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Some weeks have passed, things happened.

This article sums up more or less what I said earlier: <https://andrewsullivan.substack.com/p/the-trap-the-democrats-walked-right>

Basically the Democrats made a pact with the devil (BLM/Antifa) and are now paralyzed: they are unwilling or unable to condemn the violence (in some cases actually supporting it, by mayors instructing police not to take action), and it is has got too far out of hand. Law and order have slipped out of their hands.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 9:44 PM

It disturbs me how easily Americans use the term 'fascist'.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:00 AM

Anyway, it's funny how you seem totally brainwashed and actually think the goal should be to get Trump out of office... And then what? You don't even know. Then Democrats will look for a solution? They certainly don't have one now.

It seems the biggest problem is that the Democrats have been throwing everything they had at Trump for the past 5 years. Instigating endless hate into the people, and dividing the country. And it seems it may not even be enough to keep Trump out of office.

I think Trump's campaign actually has the answer: he wants to bring the American people together again. His main problem is that the Democrats will never let him.

Guess it's a lose-lose situation. If you vote for Trump, you basically vote for Democrats continuing to tear down the country. If you vote for Democrats, you are rewarding them for tearing down the country.

And I don't trust that the Democrats would even know how to build the country back up, even if they do win. But by god are they a bunch of immoral bastards.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:00 AM

=== Rhetorical questions begin ===

You wrote "Once you move away from rationality and objectivity and replace it with emotion and vaguely determined language, you are on your way to fascism/communism." Is that not Trump?

You wrote "A wrecking crew. They don't answer to the state, the law or anything. They just intimidate anyone with the 'wrong' views." Is that not Trump? Someone who puts a Postmaster General into office with the intent of defunding the post office to steal elections? Someone who said on video that they wouldn't accept the results of the election?

You wrote "(again, media control and propaganda was a huge part of fascism)." Is that not Trump? Someone who spreads lies on a daily basis? Denying that COVID-19 isn't that big a problem in the USA when we lead the world in spread and deaths?

==== Rhetorical questions end ====

Why do you care so much about this? Are you worried leftists are going to somehow wrestle control from the government, form a communist military, and start invading other countries or something? How do the USA BLM demonstrations affect you directly?

On 8/28/2020 2:44 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

It disturbs me how easily Americans use the term 'fascist'.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)  
Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>  
A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>  
You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:18 AM

I don't think you understand the Democratic party. Democrats are in favor of raising taxes to generate money for programs that help the country. Homelessness, special education, supporting veterans, universal healthcare, etc. They are pro-choice, for gender equality, for racial equality. They fall on the side of helping people. How are you getting from that to "immoral bastards" that want to "tear down the country"?

The Democrats have \*not\* been throwing everything they have at Trump. Just because I'm against Trump doesn't mean I'm for our existing Democrats. Some of them need to be recycled as well, and replaced with people who can get more things done.

I've only ever Trump divide the country, not try to unite it. Especially now, he had a historic moment during a pandemic to unite everyone against a common goal, but instead undermined efforts to deal with it, most notably leaving testing and quarantining to individual states. So of course, individual states did everything differently (including not wearing masks and opening too early and holding public events) and it's out of control. Failing to issue federal mandates to reduce the spread of the virus is not the work of someone trying to unite the country. Not to mention all the downplaying of how bad it was, distancing from the WHO, forcing the CDC to publish numbers through his office instead of publicly, etc.

On 8/28/2020 6:00 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Anyway, it's funny how you seem totally brainwashed and actually think the goal should be to get Trump out of office... And then what? You don't even know. Then Democrats will look for a solution? They certainly don't have one now.

It seems the biggest problem is that the Democrats have been throwing everything they had at Trump for the past 5 years. Instigating endless hate into the people, and dividing the country. And it seems it may not even be enough to keep Trump out of office.

I think Trump's campaign actually has the answer: he wants to bring the American people together again. His main problem is that the Democrats will never let him.

Guess it's a lose-lose situation. If you vote for Trump, you basically vote for Democrats continuing to tear down the country. If you vote for Democrats, you are rewarding them for tearing down the country.

And I don't trust that the Democrats would even know how to build the country back up, even if they do win. But by god are they a bunch of immoral bastards.

On Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 9:44 PM Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org) <<mailto:scali@scali.eu.org>>> wrote:

It disturbs me how easily Americans use the term 'fascist'.

On Fri, Aug 28, 2020 at 9:42 PM Jim Leonard <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

-- Jim Leonard ([trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org) <<mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>>)  
Check out some trippy MindCandy: <http://www.mindcandydvd.com/>  
A child borne of the home computer wars: <http://trixter.oldskool.org/>  
You're all insane and trying to steal my magic bag!

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <[trixter@oldskool.org](mailto:trixter@oldskool.org)>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <[scali@scali.eu.org](mailto:scali@scali.eu.org)>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:23 AM

On 8/28/2020 6:00 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

| And then what? You don't even know. Then Democrats will look for a solution? They certainly don't have one now.

A solution to domestic terrorism, I'm assuming is what you're referring to? Or are you referring to something else?



USA has many problems. Armed, violent people at some BLM protests is only one of them, and is not our biggest problem. I know you disagree, but it is not our biggest problem.

[Quoted text hidden]

Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:23 AM

You wrote "Once you move away from rationality and objectivity and replace it with emotion and vaguely determined language, you are on your way to fascism/communism." Is that not Trump?

No it is not. Trump is clearly not someone who plays on emotion. He clearly has his limitations, but within his capabilities he tries to be rational and objective.

The Democrats, BLM, Antifa... these people are playing on emotion, and have nothing rational or objective to offer.

You wrote "A wrecking crew. They don't answer to the state, the law or anything. They just intimidate anyone with the 'wrong' views." Is that not Trump? Someone who puts a Postmaster General into office with the intent of defunding the post office to steal elections? Someone who said on video that they wouldn't accept the results of the election?

I haven't looked into the post office thing. But assuming it's even true at all, then it has nothing to do with fascism or wrecking crews. It'd simply be a form of corruption, abuse of power.

BLM and Antifa are the wrecking crews obviously. They are doing what the fascists did: they destroy people's businesses, and intimidate people into submission for their ideology.

Trump doesn't do any of that. And he doesn't have to, as he's a democratically chosen president of a democratic country. That's not how fascism works.

You wrote "(again, media control and propaganda was a huge part of fascism)." Is that not Trump? Someone who spreads lies on a daily basis? Denying that COVID-19 isn't that big a problem in the USA when we lead the world in spread and deaths?

As crazy as it sounds for a president, Trump is not actually in control of the mainstream media at all. The majority of the mainstream media have a clear bias towards the Democrats, and spread Democrat-oriented propaganda. Which is probably one of the reasons why Trump uses Twitter so much: he can get his message to the people without anyone being able to edit, twist or censor it in any way.

The COVID-19 thing is Trump being an idiot, and that's bad. But it has nothing to do with fascism, control of media, propaganda or anything.

In fact, I have to give Trump credit for having the guts to point out Hydroxichoroquine. This drug is highly controversial, mainly because of propaganda, probably from Big Pharma who want to sell expensive vaccines. Earlier studies from about 2005 showed HCQ having positive effects with related COVID viruses. But as soon as people started reporting on using it for COVID-19, reports suddenly popped up, claiming that HCQ did nothing. Reports that later turned out to be fake.

Many countries actually banned their doctors from prescribing it (which is nonsense, as it has been in use for decades for other illnesses, such as malaria, and is considered a low-risk drug).

Slowly but surely the truth about HCQ is coming out, and it seems Trump actually was right: if you catch COVID-19 at an early stage, HCQ combined with other drugs can speed up recovery, and lead to less people having to go to IC. I think Trump is actually trying to do the right thing, but messed up. They made a total mess of things in our country as well, so it's not like Trump is unique in the world. Over here they can't decide whether face masks are a good precaution or not. Total corruption. They initially claimed they don't help, but it was later found out that they simply didn't have the stock to use them. Now they can't change their minds on it, because then they'd have to admit they were wrong/lied to us initially.

Let's face it: most politicians are completely incompetent and immoral bastards.

Why do you care so much about this? Are you worried leftists are going to somehow wrestle control from the government, form a communist military, and start invading other countries or something? How do the USA BLM demonstrations affect you directly?

You don't even know?

Firstly: most of Europe was destroyed by actual fascists during WWII. Our cities still bear the scars of fascists. These fascists also killed 6 million Jews, and who knows what else. To have people shout 'fascist' at Trump is just a huge insult to Europe. Trump is a bad president, who makes a lot of bad decisions. But he's not invading any countries, he's not destroying cities, he's not killing people, and certainly not performing genocide on racial motives.

You have to be completely brainwashed and very radicalized in your head to actually believe that Trump is a fascist. Clearly you have absolutely no concept of what fascism is, and just use the term gratuitously.

Secondly: After George Floyd, there were also BLM protests in many European countries, including The Netherlands. They destroyed various statues here as well, and put graffiti with very disturbing texts on various buildings. There were also talks about how 'systemically racist' The Netherlands was, and how all white people oppress all black people etc.

Recently we've had riots here as well, in various cities, including mine, just a few blocks from where I live. This included arson, and people were pulled out of cars and harassed. There has also been a steep increase in knife and gun violence.

In short: they're copying what happens in the US, and bringing it here. Which is ridiculous to begin with, because there never were plantations in The Netherlands, and as such, there never were black slaves here. There also never was any segregation. So our society can in no way be compared to the US.

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:29 AM

On Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:18 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org> wrote:

I don't think you understand the Democratic party. Democrats are in favor of raising taxes to generate money for programs that help the country. Homelessness, special education, supporting veterans, universal healthcare, etc. They are pro-choice, for gender equality, for racial equality. They fall on the side of helping people. How are you getting from that to "immoral bastards" that want to "tear down the country"?

I tend to differentiate between what people SAY they want or will do, and what they actually INTEND to want or do. This is typical propaganda: vague terms of 'social justice' that sound good, nobody will oppose them. But it is about how they actually implement these things in policies, that's where it matters.

Besides, the thing is, gender equality and racial equality are already in your constitution. That is a solved problem, politically. All you have to do is uphold the law. Which means these are basically conservative values. Modern conservatives are actually 'classic liberals'.

The Democrats have \*not\* been throwing everything they have at Trump. Just because I'm against Trump doesn't mean I'm for our existing Democrats. Some of them need to be recycled as well, and replaced with people who can get more things done.

For the past 5 years I've only heard a shitstorm against Trump, attempts to impeach him and tons of other insinuations. Nothing stuck.

I've only ever Trump divide the country, not try to unite it. Especially now, he had a historic moment during a pandemic to unite everyone against a common goal, but instead undermined efforts to deal with it, most notably leaving testing and quarantining to individual states. So of course, individual states did everything differently (including not wearing masks and opening too early and holding public events) and it's out of control. Failing to issue federal mandates to reduce the spread of the virus is not the work of someone trying to unite the country. Not to mention all the downplaying of how bad it was, distancing from the WHO, forcing the CDC to publish numbers through his office instead of publicly, etc.

Initially I thought that distancing from the WHO was a bad thing. But given the mess we currently have in many European countries, because the WHO doesn't really have a clue either, and all countries are getting things wrong in their own unique ways anyway, I think Trump may have called that one correctly.

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:32 AM

On Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:23 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org> wrote:

On 8/28/2020 6:00 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

> And then what? You don't even

> know. Then Democrats will look for a solution? They certainly don't have one now.

A solution to domestic terrorism, I'm assuming is what you're referring to?  
Or are you referring to something else?

I'm referring to getting the USA back to what it once was: A successful liberal democracy where every man is free, and there is law and order.

Then we can take it from there.

But the Democrats seem to have gone completely racist. Going into a system of identity politics, which will destroy liberal values, and greatly hurt the freedom of large groups of people. It will also greatly hurt the economy.

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 2:47 AM

On 8/28/2020 6:23 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Let's face it: most politicians are completely incompetent and immoral bastards.

That's about the only thing we both agree on 100% :-)

Recently we've had riots here as well, in various cities, including mine, just a few blocks from where I live. This included arson, and people were pulled out of cars and harassed. There has also been a steep increase in knife and gun violence.

I was not aware of that.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 2:56 AM

This is the message you should stick to. It sounds the most sane.

I disagree that identity politics will destroy liberal values. I find identity politics annoying -- they're not always applied correctly, for example the recent Netflix documentary series High Score -- but they deserve to exist, they have very clear reasons to exist.

Your country is weird for treating BLM the same way the USA is treating BLM. We have 150 years of racial inequality, with minorities being locked into poverty cycles; the protests, violent or peaceful, are completely understandable -- right or wrong, they're understandable. The Netherlands doesn't have this kind of history, so that's pretty baffling people are rioting there. I wonder what they're rioting against.

On 8/28/2020 6:32 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

On Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:23 AM Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org <mailto:trixter@oldskool.org>> wrote:

On 8/28/2020 6:00 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

> And then what? You don't even

> know. Then Democrats will look for a solution? They certainly don't have one now.

A solution to domestic terrorism, I'm assuming is what you're referring to?  
Or are you referring to something else?

I'm referring to getting the USA back to what it once was: A successful liberal democracy where every man is free, and there is law and order.

Then we can take it from there.

But the Democrats seem to have gone completely racist. Going into a system of identity politics, which will destroy liberal values, and greatly hurt the freedom of large groups of people. It will also greatly hurt the economy.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 1:59 PM

I disagree that identity politics will destroy liberal values.

They already are, even in our country.

It leads to tribalism. Everyone is pushed into a certain group based on their 'identity', and needs to conform to the 'groupthink'.

This inevitably leads to totalitarianism. Joe Biden already showed how racist he is, when he said: "If you're still deciding whether to vote for me or Trump, you're not black".

If you can't see how braindead and utterly illiberal that is, I don't know what to tell you.

He literally says that all blacks need to think a certain way politically: Democrat.

Which goes wrong on at least two levels:

- 1) He apparently thinks that skin colour somehow relates to political ideology, which is blatant racism.
- 2) He apparently thinks that people think in groups, not individually.

Add to that the choice of Kamala Harris, who is openly pushed as a 'woman of colour'. Funny enough she calls herself African-American, which does not really seem to be true. Her father is a white(?) Jamaican, and her mother is of Indian descent. Her appearance is Indian, not African.

And she's totally pushing the narrative of systemic racism, oppression and identity politics.

In our country, Zwarte Piet is now banned from Facebook, Instagram, and various online stores, including Amazon. This is the result of identity politics: there has been intimidation by black activists that white people would be racist, and Zwarte Piet is racist.

These companies complied with this intimidation, even though this is against what the majority of the public agrees with. So it is highly undemocratic. It is also a form of censorship. A judge ruled that the appearance of Zwarte Piet was part of freedom of speech. Yet this freedom of speech is now silenced by this boycott/censorship. I am no longer able to post pictures of Zwarte Piet, or sell items with Zwarte Piet via Amazon or other popular online platforms.

We are moving fast into a totalitarian regime, where white people will be silenced.

This is clearly racist, and clearly opposes liberal values, where every individual has freedom of speech, and will not be judged based on race, ethnicity, religion etc. The things that are actually in our constitution.

All this is subversion. They are destabilizing our society, and demoralizing the people.

Your country is weird for treating BLM the same way the USA is treating BLM.

We have 150 years of racial inequality, with minorities being locked into poverty cycles; the protests, violent or peaceful, are completely understandable -- right or wrong, they're understandable. The Netherlands doesn't have this kind of history, so that's pretty baffling people are rioting there. I wonder what they're rioting against.

I already don't understand the riots in the US. George Floyd was a criminal who overdosed on drugs, and resisted arrest.

Jason Blake was also a criminal who resisted arrest, and who went into his car to grab a knife.

If these are their 'martyrs' for oppressed black people, they need better martyrs.

In neither case I see a racist motive at all. Both were criminals, both had a record that showed they were violent, possibly armed, and dangerous. Hence, the police had every right to arrest them, and handle with extreme care. Both clearly resisted arrest, and then this is what you get.

With Floyd it now seems that he died because of the drug overdose, not because of the officer holding him down with the knee.

With Blake, it is impossible to say whether less bullets would have stopped him, or if it would have meant that Blake would have taken out the officer instead.

In both cases, these are dire situations which these criminals put themselves in. I really don't think officers would have handled differently if they were white. They shouldn't have, at any rate, for their own safety.

And it's also interesting that all 3 (white) people that were shot in Kenosha, had pretty big criminal records. So... we apparently have criminals who support the cause "Defund/abolish the police"? Well, that makes sense!

Media were quick to call the shooter "white supremacist" because he had attended a Trump rally. As if that were a KKK congregation. Police records list him as Hispanic. So he's not even white to begin with. Also, he shot white people, that's a strange thing to do for a white supremacist. But hey, the media have completely lost the plot.

I really think it's all just a case of subverting the US system. Anarchists and criminals who try to grab power.

Most black people don't seem to support the whole "defund/abolish the police" at all. They actually want more law and order, because especially in black neighbourhoods, there is a lot of crime.

It also seems that mass incarceration of black people plays a part here, which is a policy that Clinton and Biden pushed in the 90s. Black people were cracked down on hard, with long prison sentences even for minor crimes. Like smoking weed. This clearly destabilized black communities, because working men/fathers were taken out of the family, and the mothers and children were left to fend for themselves.

It is even said that this was done because privately-owned prisons wanted to make sure they had enough prisoners/cheap labour. Which is actually a form of slavery, if you think about it.

So it seems the Democrats here have quite a bad track record on how they handled the black community.

I don't really believe in massive systemic racism. I think if black people just finish their school, keep their families together, and not get cracked down by the police for minor offenses (which afaik they no longer are), the problem will solve itself.

I really believe in Martin Luther King's view of blacks just showing they're no different from other people. They don't demand respect by words, but by their actions of studying, working, being respectable etc. That way they showed that they were no different, and as such should be treated no different. And it worked. Blacks have gotten a long way. But now it's about to fall apart. And Biden is making all the wrong noises.

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 7:42 PM

I had a very long reply typed out, but I decided to erase it and instead translate your letter. Rather than reply to your fears, I'm going to write back what I am interpreting you are saying from your writing.

On 8/29/2020 6:59 AM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

Add to that the choice of Kamala Harris, who is openly pushed as a 'woman of colour'. Funny enough she calls herself African-American, which does not really seem to be true. Her father is a white(?) Jamaican, and her mother is of Indian descent. Her appearance is Indian, not African.

"Anyone who has only one black parent can't call themselves black."

"Only true black people can fight racism."

We are moving fast into a totalitarian regime, where white people will be silenced.

"I am a white nationalist."

I already don't understand the riots in the US. George Floyd was a criminal who overdosed on drugs, and resisted arrest.

Jason Blake was also a criminal who resisted arrest, and who went into his car to grab a knife.

"People who resist arrest deserved to be smothered to death, or shot at least seven times."

With Floyd it now seems that he died because of the drug overdose, not because

He died because his airway and blood flow were restricted for nearly 9 minutes. The Hennepin County Medical Examiner's report ruled it a homicide even while noting the drugs in his system.

With Blake, it is impossible to say whether less bullets would have stopped him, or if it would have meant that Blake would have taken out the officer instead.

"Unarmed people should be shot at least seven times while resisting arrest."

Most black people don't seem to support the whole "defund/abolish the police" at all. They actually want more law and order, because especially in black neighbourhoods, there is a lot of crime.

"The defund-the-police movement is not about police reform."

So it seems the Democrats here have quite a bad track record on how they handled the black community.

"Only democrats handle black communities poorly."

I don't really believe in massive systemic racism. I think if black people just finish their school, keep their families together, and not get cracked down by the police for minor offenses (which afaiik they no longer are), the problem will solve itself.

I really believe in Martin Luther King's view of blacks just showing they're no different from other people. They don't demand respect by words, but by their actions of studying, working, being respectable etc. That way they showed that they were no different, and as such should be treated no different. And it worked. Blacks have gotten a long way. But now it's about to fall apart. And Biden is making all the wrong noises.

"Institutional racism doesn't exist. Black people have the same access to education, jobs, and housing as white people."

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 8:17 PM

I had a very long reply typed out, but I decided to erase it and instead translate your letter. Rather than reply to your fears, I'm going to write back what I am interpreting you are saying from your writing.



Yea, that speaks volumes on how much you are brainwashed and radicalized. I'll re-translate things to what I really meant.

| "Anyone who has only one black parent can't call themselves black."

That's not at all what I said.

She says she's African-American. Which requires at least one parent of African descent.

Her mother is Indian, so she does not qualify.

Her father is Jamaican, but from a white family of slave owners. He himself even said that Kamala should not mis-use her Jamaican heritage like that.

I never said she "can't call herself black" or anything. But I do hope you agree with me that "African-American" in the usual context in the USA means black people born in the USA, of African descent. Which often means they are descendants of slaves.

So her profiling herself as "African-American", while her background is certainly not the usual Afro-American background, is already somewhat dubious.

So the problem (as her father also says) is that she stresses her skin colour and alleged ethnical background for identity politics.

Personally I don't care what colour your skin is, and if you feel the need to stress that you are 'black' or that you are 'African-American' or anything, you're completely missing the point. It should be about your political views. Stressing your identity is identity politics. "Vote for me because I'm black!"

And if your proposed identity is as shaky as Harris' is, then I get suspicious.

| "Only true black people can fight racism."

I never said anything like that. On the contrary: I believe that anyone can fight racism, and I find the whole notion of BLM and 'white fragility' to be extremely counter-productive, as they are essentially saying that only black people can understand racism, and white people just need to shut up and do what they say.

Clearly that is extremely counter-productive.

| "I am a white nationalist."

Yea, because white people just need to shut up and listen to black people, right?

I am perfectly in my right to say that white people should not be silenced. After all I believe that everyone should have the same rights, and be treated equally in equal circumstances. Silencing a group of people based on their skin colour is racism. I am against that.

In this case the people silenced happen to be white, like myself. I don't see why I wouldn't be allowed to comment on that. Heck, black people claim to be silenced all the time, and speak out on it (even when it often isn't true).

| "People who resist arrest deserved to be smothered to death, or shot at least seven times."

Not people, but if you're already a convicted criminal, and a warrant for your arrest is already out, and you resist, then yes.

We can't pander to criminals endlessly. It will be our downfall. We have to draw the line somewhere.

| "Unarmed people should be shot at least seven times while resisting arrest."

He wasn't unarmed. He had a knife. New information from the police says he actually put the cop in a headlock: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-8675713/Kenosha-police-union-gives-version-Blake-shooting.html>

| "The defund-the-police movement is not about police reform."

Yea, we've been over this before and you could not give a straight answer on how it was supposed to work.

You're totally brainwashed by BLM lies and mainstream media pandering to them.

It's not at all what I said anyway. I just said that most black people weren't onboard with it. Regardless of what you think that I think it means.

| "Only democrats handle black communities poorly."

That's not what I'm saying. I'm pointing out that even though the Dems say "We're the best party for blacks", their actions don't show that.

Because that's what I said earlier: what they say is not necessarily what they do.

| "Institutional racism doesn't exist. Black people have the same access to education, jobs, and housing as white people."

Pretty much yes. There may be incidents that lead them to have less access, but only marginally so. It does not prevent them from living the American Dream. Heck, richest woman in the country is (or was anyway) Oprah Winfrey.

Pretty sure she's black. Pretty sure she started with nothing. Nobody prevented her from working at a TV station, becoming a host, and starting a career. She was good at what she did, and worked hard at it, and that gets you far in a meritocracy. She happened to be black. I never gave it a second thought, until recently, with BLM and all that, and even Oprah stressing that she's black and somehow underprivileged. Eh what? I'd gladly trade everything I have, including my alleged 'white privilege' for everything Oprah has.

For some reason, certain blacks (not everyone) want to make you believe they have it oh-so-bad, and they're the 'victims' of the 'system', and all that.  
Nonsense.

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sat, Aug 29, 2020 at 8:25 PM

Anyway, the REAL point is that you don't even bother to listen. Instead you deflect everything, completely misconstrue everything I say, and insult me to the bone by saying I'm a white supremacist and racist. This is exactly the problem in society today.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jim Leonard** <trixter@oldskool.org>  
To: Scali Bohemiq <scali@scali.eu.org>

Sun, Aug 30, 2020 at 12:52 AM

On 8/29/2020 1:17 PM, Scali Bohemiq wrote:

I had a very long reply typed out, but I decided to erase it and instead translate your letter. Rather than reply to your fears, I'm going to write back what I am interpreting you are saying from your writing.

Yea, that speaks volumes on how much you are brainwashed and radicalized.

You know what? I just now read that and stopped and immediately started typing this reply. I'm not going to read what you wrote. I was trying to be as open and diplomatic as possible, and that's how you react? You speak of propaganda and attacking the messenger instead of the message, and then you just turn around and do the same thing.

I'm not an idiot, and I'm not brainwashed. I'm also not radicalized; I've held these beliefs since high school when I saw racism with my own eyes, multiple times. I've tried to be diplomatic in these conversations, but you're so radically far right that I can't see you as anything other than a white supremacist, trying to justify your views by wrapping your speech in ideals that are out of touch with the real world, naive, and impractical. I don't think you've ever actually witnessed racism in the real world with your own eyes, because if you had, you wouldn't be such a callous person towards these issues.

I don't think you have any clue just how much it takes to get me furious, so congratulations, I'm now furious. You're really quite the asshole sometimes. I'm going to pretend that \*all\* of our political discussions never occurred and we can go back to making demos or some other such stuff. Don't contact me regarding anything political ever again or it's going to do some permanent damage. If you feel the need to condemn what's going on in the USA, gain US citizenship and vote and protest, or get involved with some groups, or write some public essays condemning democrats or leftists or whatever. You're entitled to your opinion, that's a basic right and a freedom we enjoy here. Just don't tell me about it.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Scali Bohemiq** <scali@scali.eu.org>  
To: Jim Leonard <trixter@oldskool.org>

Sun, Aug 30, 2020 at 1:08 AM

You know what? I just now read that and stopped and immediately started typing this reply. I'm not going to read what you wrote. I was trying to be as open and diplomatic as possible, and that's how you react?

If that's as open and diplomatic as you can be, you have serious issues. You've been the aggressor all the time. Calling me white supremacist, racist and whatnot. You denounce everything I say, or every bit of information I try to provide merely on the basis of the source. Never bothering to look at the actual information, not trying to look for any nuance.

And you regurgitate the standard woke rhetoric.

You speak of propaganda and attacking the messenger instead of the message, and then you just turn around and do the same thing.

Where exactly did I do anything like that? Because I surely didn't. You just interpret it that way. Like you misinterpret everything I say, and then sling accusations around.

I'm not an idiot, and I'm not brainwashed. I'm also not radicalized; I've held these beliefs since high school when I saw racism with my own eyes, multiple times. I've tried to be diplomatic in these conversations, but you're so radically far right that I can't see you as anything other than a white supremacist, trying to justify your views by wrapping your speech in ideals that are out of touch with the real world, naive, and impractical. I don't think you've ever actually witnessed racism in the real world with your own eyes, because if you had, you wouldn't be such a callous person towards these issues.

This is exactly the thing. Me? Radically far-right? In what universe? I'm European. We are so incredibly left-wing and socialist, you Americans can't even conceive.

You just have no clue of what 'far right' actually is, because you've been brainwashed by left-wing propaganda. The media are so extremely left-wing that even a common centrist liberal stance is framed as 'far right' now.

All I can say is a huge FUCK YOU for calling me a white supremacist. Do you have any fucking clue? You can't go around calling people that. Especially not people from Europe, who live in countries that have been occupied by ACTUAL white supremacists: Nazis.

You are accusing me of being what I despise most. You have absolutely no idea. So again: FUCK YOU. Also, get a fucking clue about life, before it's too late.